

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

# The Classical Review

GENERAL LIBRARY  
JUN 24 1915  
UNIV. OF MICH.

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.  
A. D. GODLEY, M.A., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

## Board of Management:

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., Chairman.

W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A., Hon. Treasurer.

E. HARRISON, M.A., Hon. Secretary.

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.

Prof. GILBERT MURRAY,

LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L.

With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

Prof. A. G. CLARK, M.A. Representing the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A., Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Principal W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., University of Melbourne; Prof. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D., Harvard University.

Vol. XXIX

JUNE, 1915

No. 4

## CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:	PAGE	REVIEWS (continued):	PAGE
Clenard as an Educational Pioneer. FOSTER		Buttrage's <i>Nazareth and the Beginnings of Christianity</i> . W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE	118
WATSON—II. . . . .	97	Kühner's <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache</i> and Bennett's <i>Syntax of Early Latin</i> . W. E. P. PANTIN	119
Notes on Greek Orators. H. RICHARDS	100	Map, <i>De Nugis Curialium</i> . C. C. J. WEBB	121
The Nationality of Vergil. G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ	104	Sihler's <i>Cicero of Arpinum</i> . ALBERT C. CLARK	124
NOTES:		SHORT NOTICES:	
Aristotle, <i>De Mundo</i> , 399a, 7. W. L. LORIMER	111	Bailey, <i>Some Greek and Roman Ideas of a Future Life</i> . FRANK GRANGER	125
Aristophanes, <i>Aves</i> , 488-498. W. L. LORIMER	111	<i>A School Atlas of Ancient History</i> . G.	126
Note on the Phrase <i>Ὀρχαμος Ἀνδρῶν</i> . F. A. WRIGHT	111	Fleschenberg's <i>Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Romanes im Altertum</i> . S. GASELEE	126
Sophocles, <i>Trachiniae</i> , 331. J. E. HARRY	112	Schoff's <i>Parthian Stations</i> . W. H. D. R.	126
Sabinus' Edition of Persius. W. M. LINDSAY	112	Pais' <i>Studi Storici per l'Antichità Classica</i> . H. STUART-JONES	126
REVIEWS:		CORRESPONDENCE	127
Ure's <i>Black Glaze Pottery from Rhitsona in Boeotia</i> . JOHN L. MYRES	113	BOOKS RECEIVED	128
Wagner, <i>The Beginning of Life</i> . CLIFFORD ALLBUTT	115		
Hall, <i>The Ancient History of the Near East, from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Salamis</i> . W. H. D. R.	116		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

BOSTON, MASS.: GINN & COMPANY, 29 BEACON STREET

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. net; U.S.A., 30 cents net. Yearly Subscription (Eight Numbers), 7s. 6d., Post Free. U.S.A., \$2.00 net.

## WHERE TO BUY YOUR BOOKS

### A. & F. DENNY

BOOKSELLERS  
AND  
BOOKBINDERS

147, Strand, London, W.C.

(OPPOSITE GAIETY THEATRE)

### BOOKS

FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND  
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

### J. POOLE & CO.

104, CHARING CROSS ROAD  
LONDON, W.C.

### JUST ISSUED

A CATALOGUE OF  
MISCELLANEOUS SECOND-HAND  
BOOKS

Messrs. HATCHARD request the  
honour of a visit to inspect their  
extensive Collection of Second-  
hand and Rare Books.

### HATCHARDS

187, PICCADILLY, LONDON, W.

### THE HISTORIES OF TACITUS

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION

BY GEORGE GILBERT RAMSAY

M.A. OXON., LL.D., LITT.D.

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF HUMANITY IN THE  
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

WITH INTRODUCTION, NOTES, AND MAPS

Demy 8vo. 15s. net. [Just out]

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual 'Proceedings' of the Association and of the Year's Work in Classical Studies (both post free). They may also obtain the CLASSICAL REVIEW and CLASSICAL QUARTERLY at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public, viz. 7s. 6d. for the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 12s. 6d. for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY, or 18s. for the two Journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed either to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. Williamson, 46, Park Road, Pendleton, Manchester; or to the Hon. Secretaries, Mr. W. H. Duke, Jesus College, Cambridge, and Professor Slater, Bedford College, London, N.W.; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss R. H. Rees, Ladybarn House, Withington, Manchester; Mr. R. W. Reynolds, King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. H. A. Ormerod, Grey Cottage, Blundell Road, Hightown, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss A. Woodward, Badminton House, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. O. R. A. Byrde, Royal Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Mr. J. M. MacGregor, Bedford College, London, N.W.; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. P. W. Dodd, The University, Leeds; and the Rev. Father Ailing, S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay

d  
n  
l  
o  
e  
  
l  
;  
.  
e  
n  
.  
e  
.

[illegible]

p.



# The Classical Review

JUNE, 1915

## ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

### CLENARD AS AN EDUCATIONAL PIONEER.

#### II.

LET us remember that when Clenard began to teach at Louvain, in 1518, printing had only been introduced for about half a century. In 1474, John of Westphalia produced the first Louvain-printed book. An English scholar, the Rev. Henry Anstey, writing of the University of Oxford in the first half of the fifteenth century, i.e. just before the introduction of printing, says:<sup>1</sup> 'It is not easy for us to conceive what the difficulty must have been in acquiring and teaching the Latin language *without books*; and that literally was the problem that had to be solved. . . . The instruction was wholly oral. Without dictionaries or grammars, and in their Halls and Inns, crowded together as they certainly were without privacy or necessary quiet for preparation, it is difficult to conceive what must have been the discomfort, or worse, of the poor scholar in the long dark evenings of the autumn and winter terms, and what the labour of instruction during the hours of daylight. And it will be remembered that the Latin to be acquired was never considered at this time as an exercise of scholarship, a means to a cultured style, a classical education, but as a language, first for current use in disputations, chiefly

logical and theological; and for those who, after attaining the M.A. degree, proceeded to the higher steps, as an instrument for opening the treasures of a student's life, and moving freely in a literature of which such Latin was the only source.'

We can understand that a sympathetic teacher like Clenard might feel his time well spent if he wrote clear, short grammars to help the earnest student, in the early part of the sixteenth century, when the art of printing enabled his useful teaching experience to be embodied in textbooks, which would circulate far beyond his personal *clientèle*. For the mediaeval grammarian had glorified grammar by importing into it metaphysical conceptions and laborious compilations of grammatical rules and exceptions, which made grammar an end in itself—quite apart from any usefulness for the purpose of reading classical authors. Clenard's aim, therefore, became how to afford to the pupil the knowledge of just that amount of grammar which would enable him to read readily a Latin, Greek, or Hebrew author, and which would *form a basis* for speaking or writing in those languages. Skill in reading and writing a foreign or dead language Clenard recognised came from *practice* alone. No amount of even accurate statement of grammatical information learned beforehand in a textbook will be available when the pupil is in the midst of

<sup>1</sup> *Epistolae Academicæ*, Oxon. (1898), vol. i., p. xix.

actual reading of authors. He learns *usage* by reading authors, by observing the idioms and phrases, and even syntax and accident in passages, i.e. with the contexts in which they appear.

Clenard, like his great Louvain contemporary, J. L. Vives, understood what the latter says in his *de Tradendis Disciplinis* (1531): 'There is no need to frame systematic rules for learning a language which is in present and continual use'; and for this reason 'the language is learned better and more quickly from the people themselves.' Latin grammar is the result of the inferences which have been made as to what the Latin language once was 'when it was a vernacular and mother-tongue.' Both Vives and Clenard would agree that both Latin and Greek would be better learned from mixing with those who speak Latin and Greek correctly. But it was the great trouble of the Renaissance scholars that the old mediaeval tradition of Latin-speaking was antagonistic to the Latin of the classical authors. Latin and Greek grammar became matters of urgency because of the barbarisms introduced into both spoken and written Latin and Greek. As Vives says: 'The Spanish *barbarissans* is not understood by the German *barbarissans*, and *vice versa*.'

The problem of teaching Hebrew seemed to Clenard even still more difficult. He therefore first wrote a Hebrew, then a Greek, and finally a Latin grammar. His *Tabula in Grammaticen Hebraeam* was published in 1529 by Thierry Martens, the famous Louvain printer. His aim, as Professor Nève has said, was to show the structure of the language by a *coup d'œil*, and as in a mirror. He wrote his book with the deliberate intention of avoiding any injury to the use of the Hebrew textbook of his master, John Campensis, issued in 1528. His desire was to simplify, not to be comprehensive. He seems to have been successful. It was found that 'at the end of a few months' several students of his book were able 'to write letters in the form of themes.' He inspired readers with the feeling that Hebrew was not beyond their reach, and that the old Jewish grammarians had been unnecessarily prolix

and difficult.<sup>1</sup> Clenard followed the views of Vives: 'In the study of grammar I would wish the application of diligence, yet study should not be immoderate, lest the minds of students be overwhelmed with details.'<sup>2</sup> Yet, on the whole, Clenard was broader-minded than Vives with regard to the teaching of Hebrew. For Vives advised caution in the teaching of Hebrew. He inclines to restrict its study to the Hebrew of the Old Testament, for he fears there are deliberate falsifications by Jews, 'partly through their hatred of Christ, partly through inertia, since these people so often change their abodes, and have not leisure to bestow due labour on literature.' Clenard was rather more impressed with the idea of including Hebrew as a learned language, attractive to intellectual study like Greek, and, from the practical side, an instrument, perhaps, for the conversion of Jews to Christianity.

However, Clenard, with his characteristic versatility, turned his attention from Hebrew grammar to Greek grammar, for which, of course, there was a much greater call. Greek, of course, was the subject which all the aspiring students of the Renaissance period particularly regarded as the sign and seal of advanced studies. In 1530 at Louvain, the celebrated Rutgers Rescius, of Louvain, published Clenard's *Institutiones linguae Graecae*. At this date it is worth notice that the man who was to become the best-known schoolmaster in Europe, John Sturm, was the partner of Rescius. Published thus by a future schoolmaster, the book was dedicated to a schoolmaster of Malines, Francis Hoverius, to whom in later years from Paris, Evora, and Braga, Clenard addressed some of his charming letters.

The *Institutiones* consists of—

1. The *Institutiones absolutissimae*, i.e. the amount of grammar absolutely necessary for the student to be able to read Greek authors—the alphabet, the canons of pronunciation, the eight parts of speech, the five cases, the three numbers, declension of the article, the ten declen-

<sup>1</sup> See F. Nève, *La Renaissance des Lettres en Belgique*, pp. 231-2.

<sup>2</sup> J. L. Vives, *De Tradendis Disciplinis*, Bk. III., chap. i.

sions (i.e. five declensions of simple nouns, and five declension of contracted nouns), conjugations, verbs barytone and verbs contracted, verbs in  $\mu$ , the different kinds of pronouns, articles, and adverbs, conjunctions and prepositions. It will be borne in mind that all Clenard's books are written in the Latin language.

2. *Annotationes in nominum verborumque difficultates*, i.e. notes on nouns-adjective, nouns of number, verbal nouns; notes on the declensions and heteroclite nouns.

3. *Investigatio thematis in verbis anomalis*. This consists of a list of anomalous verbs, with their primitive tenses.

4. *Compendiosa et luculenta Syntaxeos ratio*.<sup>1</sup> Only peculiarities of syntax differing from Latin usage are noted and compared—cf. genitive absolute, Attic accusative, and so on. As for further treatment on Greek phrases, Clenard refers students to the *Commentarii Linguae Graecae* of the great Greek scholar, Budaeus, lately printed by Badius. 'Whoever wishes to take Greek studies seriously must get for himself that book.'

Henry Hallam's notice<sup>2</sup> of Budaeus and of Clenard states excellently the status of both these Greek grammarians: 'These Commentaries of Budaeus stand not only far above anything else in Greek literature before the middle of the sixteenth century, but are alone in their class. What comes next, but at a vast interval, is the Greek grammar of Clenard. It was, however, much beyond Budaeus, in extent of circulation, and probably, for this reason, in general utility.' But Clenard never counted himself a scholar; it was his proud boast to be as good a teacher as he could be.

In 1531 (the year after Clenard's *Institutiones* first appeared) Juan Luis Vives published his *de Tradendis Disciplinis*. He does not mention Clenard. The Greek grammar he recommends for the beginner is that of Gaza, the first part of

which had been translated from Greek into Latin by Erasmus. Some light is thrown on the difficulties of teaching of the times, when Vives says 'a Greek dictionary is still a desideratum.' On the other hand, there was a pedagogic gain in the pupil's self-activity in collecting from the authors whom he read all words and phrases newly observed, and virtually in making his own dictionary. Clenard's skeleton of a grammar by no means took away the necessity of using copious paper-books, to record not only words and phrases, dictionary-wise, but also unusual grammatical forms and syntactical usages. As to the long sway of Clenard in the schools, Hallam notes that in England Clenard's grammar owed much to Clenard, and points out that, even into the 19th century, Greek grammarians follow Clenard in most of the innovations which he made, and that the frequent choice of the same examples as those of Clenard can scarcely be an accident. If we wish to estimate Clenard's influence as a teacher, we must clearly attach considerable importance to the *Institutiones*.

Clenard also wrote *Meditationes graecanicae in artem grammaticam*, which he published in July, 1531, at Louvain, but by Bartholomew Gravius. This was dedicated to James Canta, chamberlain of the famous Cardinal Campeggio. In his dedicatory letter, Clenard states: 'Very often it has come into my mind to write a book which might serve as a teacher to those who study in all the poverty of deprivation of the living voice of the Greeks, after they have first tasted Greek grammar.'

M. Alphonse Roersch, of the University of Ghent, has admirably described this book,<sup>3</sup> as follows: 'The epistle of St. Basil to St. Gregory of Nazianzen on life in solitude, accompanied by the Latin interpretation of Budaeus, and a word-for-word translation by Clenard: such is the basis of the *Meditationes*. Round the text are grouped an infinity of notes. They enclose, under the form of a continued and highly developed com-

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that Vives gives his explanation of the fact that syntax is so cursorily treated by previous writers, even amongst the Greeks themselves. He says 'the Greek language was well spoken for a longer time by the people than was the case with Latin, so that there was less need for scrutiny and rules' (*De Tradendis Disciplinis*, Book III., chap. vii.).

<sup>2</sup> Introduction to the *Literature of Europe* (1855 edition), vol. i., p. 336.

<sup>3</sup> *Étude sur la Vie et les Travaux de Nicolas Clénard*. Par Victor Chauvin et Alphonse Roersch. Bruxelles, 1900. Pp. 60, 61. This book is indispensable for a comprehensive and detailed study of Clenard.

mentary, a great number of grammatical explanations, and a very detailed analysis of grammatical forms. They often send the reader back to the *Institutiones* and render an account of certain special features which that book presents. Comparisons between the Greek and Latin are not rare. By the side of practical advice addressed to masters and pupils we find in the work remarks of a general kind, such as the considerations on the manner of interpreting authors. We meet, also, in places with reasonable criticism of Budé and some corrections of Basil's text. Clenard thus, as it were, attempts to stand by the side of the student reading Basil's epistle, and the book, supplies the place of the oral teacher. To the student of the history of education to-day, such a volume reveals much of the pedagogical aims and processes in Clenard's thought, in some ways more effectively than a formal treatise on linguistic method.

Briefly, his merits as a Greek grammarian may well be described in the words of M. Roersch.<sup>1</sup> 'He is far removed from the scholastic subtleties of the Middle Ages. He is the declared enemy of all pedantry. To take away for ever from grammars their repellant aspect, to make easier the beginnings, and thus to open out to everyone the treasures of ancient erudition—such is his aim. The pupil, instead of being frightened, must have obstacles cleared away. Instead of being wearied, the pupil must be interested from the first hour of study, and must have his interest retained by the earliest reading of authors.' There are many indications that it was the success of Clenard as an oral teacher which suggested to him the idea of his textbooks.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 69-70.

#### NOTES ON GREEK ORATORS.

##### DEMOSTHENES.

*Ol.* 2. 15. ταῦθ' ἂ μὴδεὶς πώποτε κ.τ.λ. Rather perhaps τοιαῦθ' ἂ. Cf. *oia* in *De Pace* 5.

In 14 I would now read τὸ συνάμφοτερον for τοῦτο συναμφοτερον, not τοῦτο τό as I formerly suggested. In 2, if I was right in thinking an infinitive lost, and if the word was ἀμελεῖν or ὀλιγορεῖν, it should, to avoid hiatus, follow προειμένους.

*Ib.* 30. Surely the pronoun before ἐπιτάττειν should be a dative governed by it, as Lambinus and others have thought. Cf. on Andocides 1. 25 below.

*Phil.* 1. 32. It is to my mind very unlikely that Demosthenes, so careful an artist in words, allowed ὑπάρχει both to begin and to end the sentence. If in one of the two places we read ὑπάρξει, like ραδίως ἔσται following, the effect would be less unpleasant; but a quite different word would be better. The present repetition is like that of an unskilful impromptu speaker.

*Ib.* 48. I think Reiske was right in wishing to add something to οἱ δὲ λόγους πλάττοντες ἕκαστος περιερχόμεθα. οἱ δέ are others, distinct from those already mentioned, whereas in λόγους πλάττοντες there is nothing new to distinguish them. All the men mentioned λόγους πλάττουσι; the distinction is in the contents of the λόγοι. I suggest <ἐτέρους> ἕκαστος.

*Ib.* 51. νῦν δ' ἐπ' ἀδήλοις οὔσι τοῖς ἀπὸ τούτων ἐμαντῶ γενησομένοις ὅμως ἐπὶ τῷ συνοίσειν ὑμῖν ἂν πράξητε ταῦτα πεπεῖσθαι λέγειν αἰροῦμαι.

The first ἐπὶ is perfectly idiomatic in its use; the second (instead of διὰ τὸ πεπεῖσθαι) seems questionable, and in any case the double ἐπὶ is unskilful. Perhaps then it is the erroneous repetition of a copyist and Demosthenes really used διὰ τό. In the last words of the speech we might have expected ἤρημαι rather than αἰροῦμαι, like πεπαρησίασμαι above, but no doubt the present tense is admissible.

*De Pace* 11. ταῦτα τοίνυν ἀπανθ' ὅσα φαίνομαι βέλτιον τῶν ἄλλων προορῶν



οὐδ' εἰς μίαν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, οὔτε δεινότητ' οὔτ' ἀλαζονείαν ἐπανοίσω.

Do not these words gravely accept and adopt the idea that there may be on the speaker's part some degree of pretence (ἀλαζονεία)? 'I will not refer them either to cleverness or to pretence (on my part).' Demosthenes' real words were, I think, not οὔτε . . . οὔτε, but εἶτε . . . εἶτε. Two passages in the *De Corona* are very apposite: 270 συγχωρῶ τὴν ἐμὴν εἶτε τύχην εἶτε δυστυχίαν ὀνομάζειν βούλει πάντων αἰτίαν γεγενῆσθαι, and 277 εὐ οἶδ' ὅτι τὴν ἐμὴν δεινότητα . . . ἔστω γὰρ· καίτοι κ.τ.λ. εἰ δ' ἄρ' ἔστι καὶ παρ' ἐμοὶ τις ἐμπειρία τοιαύτη, κ.τ.λ., where he modestly throws doubt on his own δεινότης and substitutes another word, though of course between ἀλαζονεία and ἐμπειρία in themselves there is no affinity. In the *De Pace* then, reading εἶτε . . . εἶτε, the sense will be 'put them down to any cleverness real or pretended.'

*Phil.* 2. 25. ἀλλοτριωτάτας ταύτῃ ταύτης? In *Isocr.* 14. 51 οὐδ' ἀλλότριοι τυγχάνομεν ὑμῖν ὄντες the dative certainly need not depend on ἀλλότριοι. Cf. on *Phil.* 4. 39 below.

*Ib.* 37. μετὰ τοῦ πάντων κινδύνου καὶ τῆς ζημίας δίκην ὑποσχεῖν. *Malim* τῆς πάντων ζημίας *Reiske*. I suggest καὶ ζημίας τὴν δίκην.

[*De Halon.*] 13. τὰ σύμβολα ταῦτα γίνεταί εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ μηδ' ἀμφισβητήσαι εὐλόγως ἔτι Ποτειδαίας.

Read <ἀν> ἀμφισβητήσαι.

*De Cherson.* 14. Probably ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνοίας τῆς αὐτῆς ἥσπερ (not ὥσπερ) νῦν, as was long ago suggested. Cf. *De F. Leg.* 342 ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἥσπερ νῦν ἐξουσίας, and on *Isoc.* 15. 141 below. *Phil.* 1. 39 τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὥσπερ is not a good parallel, because ὥσπερ, the adverb of manner, is very suitable to τρόπον.

*Ib.* 75. τὰ μὲν ἔργα παρ' ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ζητεῖτε, τὰ δὲ βέλτιστα ἐπιστήμη λέγειν παρὰ τοῦ παριόντος.

ἐπιστήμη has been doubted. Blass actually adopted on his own conjecture τὰ δὲ βέλτιστ' ἢ μὴ [λέγειν], in which the ἢ μὴ is really ludicrous, and Sandys suggests ἢ δὲ βέλτιστ' ἔνεστι λέγειν.

Plato *Ion* 532c may however be quoted in its defence, τέχνη καὶ ἐπιστήμη περὶ Ὀμήρου λέγειν ἀδύνατος εἶ, and also *Rep.* 422c, though the latter is not quite parallel. If ἐπιστήμη here is wrong, ἐπιστάμενον would seem preferable to the above suggestions.

*Phil.* 3. 30. ὅσα μὲν ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων ἢ ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔπασχον οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἄλλ' οὖν ὑπὸ γνησίων γε ὄντων τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἡδικοῦντο.

No other instance of γνήσιος with a genitive is cited, nor does it seem quite natural. If there is none, perhaps we may think of γνησίως. Cf. [59.] 28 γνησίως μετέχοντας τῆς πολιτείας, 122 τοῦ παιδοποιεῖσθαι γνησίως, and *Isocr.* 4. 24 καλῶς καὶ γνησίως γεγόνάμεν.

*Ib.* 4. 19. μηδ' αὐτοὶ χειροτονήσαντες πόλεμον βούλεσθε παρ' αὐτοῖς ὑμῖν ἐρίζειν εἰ δέον ἢ μὴ δέον ὑμᾶς τοῦτο πεποιηκέναί.

The last words cannot be right. It is, or was, or will be, δέον or οὐ δέον to do a thing, never to have done it. From the very meaning of the word it must be prospective at the time to which it applies, expressing a need or obligation that something be then done. The author might have said εἰ δέον ἢ μὴ δέον τοῦτο πεποιήκατε; with ὑμᾶς and the infinitive I conjecture something to be lost, e.g. λεκτέον or νομιστέον.

*Ib.* 39. εἰ τῇ παρὰ τῆς τύχης βοηθείᾳ γεγονυῖα τοῖς ἀπόροις φθονοῦμεν.

τῆς . . . βοηθείας γεγονυῖας, the usual construction with φθονῶ? Cf. on *Phil.* 2. 25 above.

*Ib.* 52. ὁ βασιλεὺς ἅπασιν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν οἰκείως ἔχει καὶ πάντων ἡκίστα δὴ ἡμῖν.

The latter clause has been gravely suspected and altered so as to produce an antithesis (πάντων ἡκίστα δέ and the like). I agree rather with *Reiske* that a negative has been lost in the earlier words, <οὐκ> οἰκείως (= ἐχθρῶς or ὑπόπτως). The general sense of the context requires this. The author is saying that things are now more disturbed than ever before. Formerly there were two great parties, and the Persian king took up the cause of one or the other as suited him. Now there is much more confusion. The king is hostile to all Greeks alike, while each

State is fighting for its own hand and standing aloof from others. Friendship on the King's part to everyone could hardly be a cause of confusion (*ταραχή*). But the words *ἔπειτ' οὐχ ἦττον κ.τ.λ.* must be admitted to come in rather strangely.

*ἀνοικείως* may be preferable to *οὐκ οἰκείως*, but for the meaning *unfriendly* there seems no Attic authority, though it is probable enough.

*De Megalop.* 11. To avoid hiatus, *᾽Ωρωπὸν κομίσασθαι* is at least as likely as Benseler's *κομίσασθαι τὸν ᾽Ωρωπὸν*. In 13, etc., the name occurs without an article, in other places with one.

*De Foedere* 16. *ἔτι δ' ἕτερον δείξω τὸ λελυκὸς τὰς συνθήκας*.

The article is oddly used after *ἕτερον*, an other thing. Indeed, the Greek words would rather mean 'I will show that what broke the agreement was something else.' Should we read *τι* for *τό*?

*De Corona* 50. *ὥσπερ ἐωλοκρασίαν τινά μου τῆς πονηρίας τῆς ἐαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀδικημάτων κατασκεδάσας, ἣν ἀναγκαῖον ἦν πρὸς τοὺς νεωτέρους τῶν πεπραγμένων ἀπολύσασθαι*.

*ἀπολύσασθαι* is used regularly in relation to such words as *τὰς αἰτίας*, *τὰ κατηγορούμενα*, *τὴν διαβολήν*, etc., but in application to *ἐωλοκρασίαν* its use is very loose and improper; we may doubt whether the exact and critical judgment of Demosthenes can really have approved it in a carefully written oration. On the other hand, he is, as a matter of fact, answering accusations brought against him (see 9-19), and this is actually conveyed in figurative fashion by *ὥσπερ . . . κατασκεδάσας*, which means that Aeschines was imputing to his rival what he himself had done. It is therefore with a good deal of hesitation that I suggest what has occurred to me, that Demosthenes' own word was *ἀπολούσασθαι*.

*De Falsa Leg.* 16. It seems very probable that the infinitives *θήσειν καὶ γράψειν* are wrong, like *χαίρειν* and *χαίρειν* in 320, and that *θήσει καὶ γράψει* should be read.

*Ib.* 76. *δῆλόν ἐστι σαφῶς ὅτι πᾶσα ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη συνεσκευάσθη τοῦ περὶ Φωκίας ὀλέθρου*.

The editors do not explain what sort of genitive they take *τοῦ ὀλέθρου* to be. It cannot be possessive. It cannot mean *in the matter of, concerning*, nor *with a view to, for*, as the simple genitive is not used in either of these senses. It is not parallel to 134 *ὁ τῆς εἰρήνης χρήματ' ἀνάλωσας*, *Ol.* 3. 22 *προπέποται τῆς αὐτίκα χάριτος τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα*, and various other passages where the genitive gives that on which money, etc., has been expended, a sort of converse to the genitive of price. *ἀνάλωσας, προπέποται*, and so on, express parting with something, *συνεσκευάσθη* the opposite idea of accumulation.

In default of any good explanation I suggest *πᾶσα ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη συνεσκευάσθη <τὸ> τοῦ περὶ Φωκίας ὀλέθρου*. *τό* or *τά* with the genitive is well known in Demosthenes (Rehdantz, *Index s.v. Artikel*). I understand *πᾶσα ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη* like *Soph. El.* 301 *ὁ πάντ' ἀναλκίς οὗτος, ἢ πᾶσα βλάβη*, *Phil.* 927 *ὃ πῦρ σὺ καὶ πᾶν δαίμα*, *Ar. Thesm.* 787 *ὡς πᾶν ἐσμέν κακὸν ἀνθρώποις*, *Herod.* 1. 32 *πᾶσα ἐστὶ ἀνθρώπος συμφορὴ*. *συνεσκευάσθη* is an elaborated *ἐστὶ*. *Ar. Ach.* 121 *εὐνοῦχος ἐσκευασμένος*, *dressed as a eunuch*, and 729 *χοίρους ὑμέ σκευάσας* are partly parallel, as the predicates *εὐνοῦχος, χοίρους, ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη* express in each case an effect and result. So, too, in *Frogs* 523 *ὅτι σε παίζων Ἡρακλέα ἔνεσκεύασα*. *κατασκευάζω, make, render, so and so*, is common.

*Ib.* 89. *καὶ κατασκευαῖς ὅπλων καὶ χώρας καὶ προσόδων*.

Should not the first *καὶ* precede *ὅπλων* (perhaps *καὶ ὅπλων κατασκευαῖς*)?

*Ib.* 200. *ἀλλὰ δὴ τὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας*.

This is taken to be an exclamation, but for an exclamation the form is very unusual. We should get the common genitive if we read *ἀλλὰ δῆτα τῆς ἐξουσίας*. *ἀλλὰ δῆτα* is certainly used in asking questions, and I do not know why it should not be used here in exclaiming.

*Ib.* 209. *ταῦτα μὲν ἐστὶ μακρῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἀγώνων καὶ λόγων ἀρχή*.



Here too it would accord with usage if we read *πολλῶν καὶ μακρῶν* for *μακρῶν καὶ πολλῶν*. πολλοί regularly comes first in such a couple.

45. 86. In ταῦθ' ἅπερ ἡμεῖς write rather ταῦθ' (like τὸ πρᾶγμα ταυτό just below), and so perhaps too in 54. 22 and 30 (the third ταῦτα). We ought to remember that the accentuation in such cases is entirely at our discretion, as it cannot possibly come from the author.

47. 73. διομόσασθαι αὐτὸς καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα οὐκ ἂν ἐτόλμῃσα.

The accusatives have no construction whatever. Should we insert (say) κελεύειν after γυναῖκα, i.e. κελεύειν ὁμοῦσαι or διομόσασθαι?

58. 59. οὕτως ἔλαττον παρά τισι τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχύει <τῶν ἀποβησομένων ἀπὸ> τῆς παρρησίας?

## LYSIAS.

2. 35. οὔσης καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν σωτηρίας ἀπίστου καὶ τοῦ προσιόντος κινδύνου.

Is not some adjectival word lost, that went with κινδύνου as ἀπίστου go with σωτηρίας? We might think of δεινοῦ (μεγάλου, τοσούτου) τοῦ προσιόντος κινδύνου. Thalheim suggests τοσούτου in place of καὶ τοῦ, but this would not account for the καί.

Ib. 61. εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ κατήλθον . . . <ἐν> καινοῖς κινδύνοις τὴν παλαιὰν ἀρετὴν τῶν προγόνων μιμησάμενοι?

The dative can hardly stand alone. 'By dangers' is not the same as 'by incurring dangers.' κινδύνους quite possibly = μάχαις, but we should expect ἐν μάχαις here, not μάχαις simply.

6. 21. εἰσαχθεὶς εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον ἐδέησεν ἑαυτὸν τιμησάμενος δεσμοῦ.

For ἐδέησεν the ἔδησεν conjectured by Stephanus is usually substituted, but ἔδησεν ἑαυτὸν is a very questionable phrase. I have thought of something like <ὀλίγου ἀπολλύναι> ἐδέησεν ἑαυτὸν.

7. 6. For ἄλλως τε read ἀλλ' ὥς. When ἀλλ' ὥς καὶ became ἄλλως καί, it was natural for τε to be inserted.

Ib. 33. πάντες ἂν ὁμολογήσαιτε δικαιοτέρον εἶναι τοῖς μεγάλους χρῆσθαι τεκμηρίοις περὶ τῶν μεγάλων.

Dobree suggested μικρῶν for μεγάλων. That was certainly wrong, but I think μικροῖς should be written for μεγάλοις. The speaker has behaved properly on previous occasions ἐν μικροῖς, that is, as he explains in 32, in matters where he ran no danger or next to none. The present matter is great because the danger is very serious; but the court may infer the great from the small. μεγάλοις is the unintentional anticipation of a coming word.

12. 60. μισθωσάμενοι δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῆς πόλεως καὶ <ἄλλας τε> πόλεις ἐπάγοντες καὶ τελευτώντες Λακεδαιμονίους?

20. 12. εἰ δ' ἦν δημότης, οὐ δίκαιος διὰ τοῦτο βλάπτεσθαι ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ, εἰ μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε, ὅτι ὑμῶν ἐστὶ πολίτης.

The last words cannot be right, because the man in question was dead. I think now that we should read ὑμῶν ἐστὶ <τις> πολίτης, because so and so is a fellow-citizen of yours, an imaginary case. τις would easily disappear after τι.

Fragm. 1. 5. καὶ μοι ἀνάβητε τούτων μάρτυρες. Should not this be <οἱ> τούτων μάρτυρες?

Fragm. 271 (90). ἦν τις . . . <τὴν> τάξιν λίπη τῆς αἰδοῦς?

## ANDOCIDES.

1. 25. πρὸς τούτοις ἐγὼ πιστότης ὑμῶν ἔνεκα τάδε ποιήσω.

ὑμῶν is surely wrong. The πιστότης is that of Andocides himself, and the genitive ὑμῶν cannot mean *to you*. ὑμῖν seems required (cf. on Dem. Ol. 2. 30 above), and there is no difficulty about attaching the dative to a substantive. Cf. for instance Thuc. 5. 5. 1 περὶ φιλίας τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις.

## ISOCRATES.

7. 14. ἐστὶ γὰρ ψυχὴ πόλεως οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ πολιτεία.

It is odd to assume that there is a

'soul of the state' and only declare that soul to be the constitution. What we seem to want and what would be natural to say is ἔστι γὰρ οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ ψυχὴ πόλεως πολιτεία οἱ ἡ πολιτεία. Cf. Aristot. *Poet.* 6. 1450a 40 ἀρχὴ μὲν οὖν καὶ οἶον ψυχὴ ὁ μῦθος τῆς τραγωδίας.

12. 40. (πόλεις) τὰς παραπλησίαν καὶ τὴν δύνανται ἔχουσας καὶ περὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πράξεις γεγενημένας.

Is not παραπλησίαν out of its place? It might stand after καὶ or δύνανται or ἔχουσας, but not where it does.

15. 28. Read <ἐξ> ὧν οὐδὲν μοι πλεον γέγονε. Otherwise the genitive lacks construction.

1b. 141. ἐσκόπουσι περὶ αὐτῶν τούτων ὥσπερ ἂν ὑμῶν ἕκαστος.

ὥσπερ will at once be more idiomatic and give αὐτῶν a point which it hardly has at present. Cf. on Dem. *de Cherson.* 14 above.

19. 43. οὐ μὲντ' ἂν μοι δοκῶ φυγεῖν οὐδὲ τὴν Θρασύλλου γνώμην.

He does not mean that he would not escape, but that he would not avoid or try to escape, 'Thrasyllus' judgment. Write therefore φεύγειν.

#### AESCHINES.

2 (end). τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦμὸν ἤδη παραδίδωσιν ὑμῖν καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ νόμος.

Is it really possible for παραδίδωσιν to stand thus before ἐγὼ? If we should not write παραδίδωμεν, at any rate we might alter the order to something like τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦμὸν ἤδη καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ νόμος παραδίδωσιν ὑμῖν. In Isaeus 11. 10 παρεσκευάζοντο is now corrected to παρεσκευαζόμεθα.

3. 156. ὧν ἱερὰ καὶ τέκνα καὶ τάφους ἀπώλεσεν ἡ Δημοσθένους δωροδοκία.

τέκνα comes strangely between ἱερὰ and τάφους. Should it change places with τάφους or ἱερὰ?

H. RICHARDS.

#### THE NATIONALITY OF VERGIL.

1. IN Conington's *Vergil* (Ed. 5, I, xviii) we read: 'The name *Andes* is Celtic, and so apparently is *Vergilius*'; and in a note on the name *Vergilius*: '*Vergilius* and *Magius* were common names in Cisalpine Gaul.' The object of the following pages is to investigate these statements as fully as possible, and to attempt to estimate from Vergil's own names and those of his nearest relations the probability of his being of Celtic or some other determinable race. The method followed will be that of comparison with other proper names containing the same or similar stems from all parts of the Roman empire, collected from the indices, as far as they exist, to the volumes of the *C.I.L.* If, for example, we find that the name *Vergilius* occurs fairly frequently in other parts of Italy proper (*C.I.L.* IV, IX, X, and XIV),<sup>1</sup> we shall

be forced to conclude that though it may in one or two particular cases be a genuine Celtic name in Gallia Cisalpina (*C.I.L.* V<sup>2</sup>), yet the probabilities are against this, and we shall not be able to base any arguments merely on its occurrence in countries where the Kelts were settled. On the other hand, if *Vergilius* and cognate names occur but rarely in Italy and are common in the Celtic parts of the Roman

names found in *C.I.L.* VI (Rome) be used for purposes of comparison. In Rome, apart from the Latin population, we must expect to find foreigners from all parts of the Roman world. Livy (39, 3, 4) tells us that as early as 187 B.C. the Latin allies sent envoys to Rome, complaining that thousands of their citizens had migrated thither in order to avoid taxation in their native towns. An investigation was made, and Livy adds: *Hac conquisitione duodecim milia Latinorum domos redierunt, iam tum multitudine alienigenarum urbem onerante*. This intermingling of nationalities at Rome must have become still more complete under the empire, and it would be most unsafe to build any theories on the names of such a heterogeneous population.

<sup>2</sup> *C.I.L.* V also contains Venetia and Liguria.

<sup>1</sup> I have not consulted *C.I.L.* I, which contains the older Latin inscriptions arranged according to their dates; they are all found again in the other volumes of the *C.I.L.*, which are arranged geographically. Nor can the

empire,<sup>1</sup> we shall be able to conclude with a considerable degree of certainty that they are of Keltic origin and have merely assumed a Latin dress. Other names may be judged on the same principles, though it must never be forgotten that genuine Latin names occur very frequently in all parts of the empire, and absolute certainty can only be attained in a minority of cases.

2. The following are the names, collected from the different *Vitae*,<sup>2</sup> that we shall have to investigate: *P. Vergilius Maro*, the poet himself; *Vergilius* (cognomen *Maro*, *Stimichon*, or *Istimicon* ?), his father; *Magia* (*Maia*) *Polla*, his mother; *Silo* and *Flaccus*, his brothers; *Andes* or *Vicus Andicus*, his birthplace. Of these *Publius*, *Polla*, and *Flaccus* are common all over Italy. *Stimichon* and *Istimicon* occur in the *Vita Noricensis* and the *Vita Monacensis* respectively; these *Vitae* are of late date and abound in fantastic details, both biographical and philological. It is almost certain that the name *Stimichon*, of which *Istimicon* is merely a variant, has crept into them from Eclogue 5, 55: *Et ista iam pridem Stimichon laudavit carmina nobis*, and it therefore need not detain us longer. We will now consider the remaining names.

3. VERGILIUS occurs eight times in C.I.L. V. The figures for the other volumes are: IV 0, IX 10, X 11,

XIV 11,<sup>3</sup> II 9, III 6, VII 0, VIII (Africa) 1, XII 2, Brambach<sup>4</sup> 0—i.e. omitting VIII and for the moment V also, we find 32 examples of *Vergilius* in 26,389<sup>5</sup> inscriptions in Italy proper against 17 in 30,990 inscriptions in Keltic lands. Surely *Vergilius* cannot be called a common Keltic name! The proportion of 8 in 10,000 in North Italy is also very much smaller than that of 32 in 26,000 in the rest of Italy. Hence, on a mere numerical comparison, we must decide against the probability of *Vergilius* being Keltic. Only 2 examples in Narbonensis, only 6 in the Danube Provinces! Yet Zeuss, *Grammatica Celtica*, p. 11, says: 'Nomen uix dubiae originis Gallicae. Radix uetust. cambr. *guerg* ("efficax") gl. Ox. extat etiam in uetusto nomine Vergobretus apud Caes.' Compound names containing the first element of *uergo-bretus*, e.g. \**Vergomarus*, \**Vergorix*, etc., may have existed, though we can no longer trace them, and from them may arise the short-name *Vergius* (Holder<sup>6</sup> quotes *Οὐέρυιος* from Bordighera, Inscr. Graecae XIV 2276), from which *Vergilius* would be a perfectly correct derivative, cf. *Magius*, *Magilius*: *Magimarus*, *Magu-rix*; *Segius*, *Segilius*: *Segomarus*, *Sego-uesus*; *Matilius*: *Matomarus*; *Artilius*: *Arto-boduus*, etc. Furthermore, we must postulate a name *Vergius*, from which *Vergiacus* (3 place-names in France, see Holder) was derived. The Gallic name for the ocean, *Οὐεργίλουος* and *Οὐεργιούιος* (Ptol. 2, 2, 5 and elsewhere, see Holder) also appears to contain the same stem *uergo-*, 'efficax,' *Ir. ferg*, 'anger.' For other parallels see Hol-

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that six examples occur on one stone, so that for purposes of comparison it would, perhaps, be fairer to deduct about four.

<sup>4</sup> *Corpus Inscriptionum Rhenanarum*.

<sup>5</sup> The numbers of the inscriptions provided with indices are as follows: IV 7115 and 155 *Tabulae Ceratae*, IX 6419, X 8422, XIV 4278, II 6350, III 15,220, V (with Pais' Supplement) circ. 10,000, VII 1355, XII 6038, Brambach 2027. The *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, it is true, contains a number of additional inscriptions not yet incorporated in the C.I.L., but the instances of the names in question in its indices are so rare that we may safely leave them aside.

<sup>6</sup> *Allceltischer Sprachschatz*.

<sup>1</sup> I.e., C.I.L. II (Spain), III (mainly the Danube Provinces, but also Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt), V (Gallia Cisalpina, Venetia, and Liguria), VII (Britain), XII (Gallia Narbonensis); C.I.L. XIII (the rest of France, Belgium, Holland, and the Rhine Provinces) has unfortunately not yet been provided with an index, and the large number of inscriptions it contains would have made the labour of collecting the Keltic names from them quite disproportionate to the scope of the present paper. It is possible that the conclusions arrived at in the following pages may have to be slightly revised when I have worked through C.I.L. XIII; but it is not probable that they will suffer any serious alteration. The volumes that deal with Italy are IV (Pompeii), IX (Calabria, Apulia, Samnium, Sabini, Picenum), X (Bruttium, Lucania, Campania, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica), XIV (Latium); C.I.L. XI (Etruria and Umbria) has, as yet, no index.

<sup>2</sup> E. Diehl, *Vitae Vergilianae* (Bonn, 1911).

der. *Vergaius*, *Virgaio* (once each in C.I.L. III) are variants for the more common *Vercaius*, *Vircaio*<sup>1</sup> (cf. *Vercillus*, *Vercius*, etc., from compound names *Vercobius*, *Vercombogius*, and the like), and cannot be cited to support *Vergilius*.

4. Do the actual examples on the inscriptions help us at all towards any judgment? Of the 8 examples in C.I.L. V, 2 are from Aquileia, 2 from Verona, 2 from Hasta, 1 from Eporedia, and 1 from Calvisano (a village about thirty miles north-west of Mantua). The last is important: it is C.I.L. V 4137 and runs: *Matronabus Vergilia C. f. Vera pro Munatia T. f. Catulla u.s.l.m.* In addition to the Keltic name *Catulla*, we have a dedication to the Keltic deities, the *Matronae* (cf. Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures* 1886, p. 100 and Windisch, *Das Keltische Britannien*, pp. 103 f.); it is tempting to conclude that *Vergilia C. f. Vera* was a Keltic woman, though that does not necessarily mean that her name was Keltic.<sup>2</sup> Yet it is evidence, even if slight, in favour of the Kelticity of the name. One of the examples from Verona must also be mentioned. It is C.I.L. V 3827 and occurs in 2 versions, as to which Mommsen concludes for sound reasons that one, namely that which he calls (b), which is first given by Jucundus (late fifteenth century), is a copy of that which he calls (a), and which is first given by Cyriacus (early fifteenth century). The versions of Cyriacus and Jucundus are as follows: (a) *M. Vergilio M. f. Anthioco* ('apud ripam fluuii Tartari' in agro Veronensi'), (b) *P. Vergilio P. f. Pont. Max. Sabin.* ('in Ande Vergilii uilla, quae nunc dicitur Pietole'). Mommsen appends the following note: 'Cyriaci exemplum legitur in uita eius Scalamentiana; item in sylloge antiqua Veronensi apud

Felicianum, Marcanouam, Ferrarinum, Sanutum (inde Muratori e schedis Alex. Capponii). Diuersum exemplum uel potius titulus ad huiusce aliquot litteras mala fraude formatus legitur apud Iucundum et inde sine dubio apud Pacedianum, quamquam hic ait excepsisse se a. 1517 Mantuae per aliquot dies moratum, Cholerum, Maccium, Grut. ex Verderii schedis (inde Orelli). Upon the inscriptions found at Mantua Mommsen adds this introductory remark: 'Vicus Pietole Mantuae suburbanus, quem Vergilii poetae natalem Andes siue Andicum uulgo opinantur opinabanturque iam aetate Dantis poetae, non tantum temere, sed certe falso, cum ex Probi testimonio constet Andes XXX m. p. a Mantua distare. The question whether these are two different inscriptions or merely two different copies of the same inscription cannot be decided with any certainty, owing to the disappearance of the original stone or stones. Mommsen adopts the latter alternative, and believes that the copy denoted as (b) is a corrupted version of (a), and that Jucundus' statement that it was found at Pietole is part of his corruption. In any case the inscription or inscriptions cannot refer to the poet Vergil, though the *Vergilius* mentioned in them may have belonged to the same family.

5. In the inscriptions of Italy proper (IV, IX, X, and XIV) we have three examples of *Vergilius* combined with the cognomen *Gallus*, IX 1085 (Ager Compisinus): *M. Vergilius C. l. Gallus*,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Possibly a Gallic slave, who took his Roman (?) master's name. If so, *Gallus* will not support *Vergilius*' claim to be Keltic. But why, if he is C. l., did he take the praenomen *M*?

*Vergilius Maro*, the grammarian (cf. Teuffel, *Geschichte d. röm. Literatur*, 6th Ed., 1913, § 497, 7), should be mentioned here. He himself says that he was a Gaul, and it seems highly probable that his nomen was derived from a Gallic stem *uergo-*. It is strange that he should bear the cognomen *Maro*. It may conceivably be a real Keltic name and different from that of the poet Vergil (see under *Maro*). But it seems more natural to suppose that the grammarian *Vergilius*, and perhaps other *Vergilii* also, were given the cognomen *Maro* in honour of the poet Vergil. The fact that the grammarian *Vergilius* was called *Maro* cannot be adduced to support the Keltic claim to the poet Vergil's cognomen. It is also quite possible that the

<sup>1</sup> For the variation between *c* and *g* see Pedersen, *Vergl. Keltische Grammatik*, I 533. *Vercobretus* occurs, but the usual form is with a *g*. There are no examples of *Vercilius* for *Vergilius*.

<sup>2</sup> *Munatia* is not Keltic, though *Catulla* is. In the case of *Vergilia Vera* the cognomen is not Keltic, but the nomen may be.

<sup>3</sup> The Tartarus at its nearest point is twelve miles from Pietole; cf. Jucundus' statement about (b).



X 4862 (Venafrum): *M. Vergilius M. f. Gallus Lusius*, X 5155 (Alvito prope Arpinum): *L. Vergilius M. f. \*Galio* (? *Gallus*). Is *Gallus* merely an honorary cognomen in these cases, or does it really point to the nationality of the bearer of the name?

6. Before concluding we must hear yet another claim. May not *Vergilius* be Etruscan? W. Schulze,<sup>1</sup> p. 100, proves that *Verginna* and *Verginius* are of Etruscan origin, and adds: 'Verwandtschaft mit *Verginna* ist der weitverbreitete Name *Vergilius*, in Etrurien C.I.L. XI 1785 (Volaterrae), 3248. 3254 (Sutrium), 3808 (Veii).' Vergil himself considered that the leading element of the population of Mantua was Etruscan;<sup>2</sup> his own cognomen, as we shall presently see, is very probably Etruscan, too.

7. To sum up then: *Vergilius* is found in most parts of the Roman empire, but especially frequently in Italy. There is a Celtic stem *uergo-*, from which *Vergilius* would be a correct Kelto-Latin formation. There is also a strong Etruscan claim to the name. We are, therefore, forced to the conclusion that though *Vergilius* may be Celtic, the evidence favours a Latin or an Etruscan origin. At the same time it must not be forgotten that names of different nationalities quite frequently appear in identical forms.<sup>3</sup> It would be quite possible to imagine a Celtic *Vergilius* and an Etrusco-Latin *Vergilius* existing side by side; but even so, the greater number of the examples would have to be attributed to the latter. Zeuss' statement should be modified accordingly.

8. MARO occurs six times in C.I.L. V. The other figures<sup>4</sup> are IV 1, IX 2, X 1, XIV 6, II 6, III 5, VII 1 (*Maro*

or *Maronius*?), VIII o, XII o, Brambach o. The name is of comparatively frequent occurrence in Latium (XIV), though not found in either Praeneste or Tusculum, but does not occur in Africa, Narbonensis, or in the Rhine Provinces. Its absence from the two latter regions is strong evidence against its being of Celtic origin, even though all five instances in C.I.L. III are from the Danube Provinces. *Maro*, the poet's name, is always scanned with *ā*,<sup>5</sup> and must be kept distinct from the Celtic names *Mārus*, *Mārio*,<sup>6</sup> etc., from a stem *māro-*, 'great.' *Maro(n)* may be Greek; the form *Maron* must be, and where it is found in Italy, it must have been introduced from Greek sources. One of the Spartans who fell at Thermopylae was called *Māpov*.<sup>7</sup> A Thracian priest of Apollo, *Māpov*, is mentioned by Homer, *Od.* ix 197.<sup>8</sup> If there was a Thracian name *Māpov*, some of the examples of *Maro* in C.I.L. III may be the same name in Latin form.

It seems clear, however, that the name came into Mantua from Etruscan sources.<sup>9</sup> Schulze, p. 189, quotes *L. Maro C. f.* from Vettona as the equivalent of the Etruscan *maru*, and adds: 'Vollständig latinisiert lautet sie etwas anders, *Maronius*.' Corssen, *Sprache der Etr.*, I 237, truly says: 'Die etruskische Nominativform *maru* verhält sich zum lateinischen Zunamen *Maro* wie etr. *Caspu* zu lat. *Caspo*.' *Vergilius Maro* may, therefore, be an Etruscan name in both nomen and cognomen. According to Phocas' life of Vergil, l. 6, Vergil's father also bore the cognomen *Maro*: *Huic genitor figulus, Maro nomine*.

9. MAGIA (Vergil's mother). The name *Magius* occurs 54 times in C.I.L. V, mostly combined with Latin cognomina, occasionally with Greek, but

nomen of the grammarian and that of the poet were of different origin, the former Celtic and the latter perhaps Etrusco-Latin; it is even conceivable that the grammarian's nomen was not Celtic, but Latin, although he was a Celt by race.

<sup>1</sup> *Zur Geschichte Lateinischer Eigennamen*.

<sup>2</sup> *Aen.* 10, 198 ff., a passage now lucidly explained by A. Rosenberg, *Der Staat der alten Italiker*, p. 129 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Magius* below.

<sup>4</sup> See footnote 1, p. 105.

<sup>5</sup> The quantity of the *a* is not marked in the inscriptions in question. Of course, a Celtic cognomen *Māro* (gen. *Mārōnis*), from the stem *māro-*, is theoretically quite possible.

<sup>6</sup> Also Etruscan, according to Schulze, p. 306.

<sup>7</sup> See Pape-Benseler, *Griech. Wörterbuch*.

<sup>8</sup> On this point Mr. Raper has built a suggestive, but somewhat imaginative series of conjectures in the *Classical Review*, 1913, p. 13 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Rosenberg, p. 48.

rarely with Keltic.<sup>1</sup> The other figures<sup>2</sup> are: IV 2, IX 20, X 20, XIV 5, II 7, III 15, VII 1 (doubtful), VIII 1, XII 15, Brambach 1. Omitting V and VIII, we get 47 examples in 26,000 inscriptions in Italy proper against 39 in 31,000 in Keltic lands outside North Italy. The proportion of 55 in 10,000 in North Italy is far greater than anywhere else throughout the empire. Further, *Magius* occurs 9 times as a cognomen<sup>3</sup> in *C.I.L.* V, in X once, and in II once. Another cognomen, *Magianus*, derived from *Magius*, occurs as follows: V 3, IV 0, IX 0, X 2, XIV 1, II 0, III 1, VII 0, XII 0. Again *C.I.L.* V has almost as many examples as all the other volumes. *Magiacus*<sup>4</sup> occurs 4 times in V, once in XII. In North Italy itself, if we compare Gallia Cisalpina with the other districts, Venetia and Liguria, taken together, we obtain the following proportions: *Magius* (nomen) 39 : 16, (cognomen) 9 : 0, *Magianus* 3 : 0, *Magiacus* 4 : 0. The stem *magio-* is a good Keltic one (see Holder II 377); we find compounds *Magimarus*, *Magiomarus*, *Magiorix*, and short-names *Magio*, *Magilo*, *Magil(l)ius*,<sup>5</sup> *Magissius*, and many others. We are perfectly justified in bringing *Magius*<sup>6</sup> into line with these; it has every right to be considered Keltic. But at the same time its frequent occurrence in Italy proper warns us that Latin has a very good claim to the name also. Furthermore, according to Schulze, p. 184, it is not without close paral-

ls in Etruria. Here, perhaps, we have the clue to its frequent occurrence in North Italy. Here it was that Romans, Kelts, and Etruscans first came into close contact with one another. What wonder, then, if a name common to all three peoples should thrive and flourish on soil that was populated by a mixed race consisting of these same three elements? But the task of separating the various *Magii* according to race will, if the foregoing suggestion be true, become a sheer impossibility. We must content ourselves with allowing the claims of Latin and Keltic, if not of Etruscan<sup>7</sup> also, though in Gallia Cisalpina the preponderating element was without doubt Keltic, and the majority of examples of the name *Magius* are without doubt Keltic too. Possibly, if not probably, Vergil's mother was a Keltic woman. The name *Maia*, which occurs in the late *Vitae Monacensis* and *Noricensis*, is undoubtedly the same as *Magia*, the only form found in the earlier *Vitae*. We find the same disappearance of *g* between two vowels in later times elsewhere too, e.g. *Briantinus* for *Brigantinus*, *Briancio* (Briançon) for *Brigantio*, and Welsh shows the same change.<sup>8</sup> Before leaving *Magius*, it is interesting to note that one example of its occurrence is at Casalpoglio, a village twenty-three miles north-west of Mantua, and that one example of *Vergilius* occurs only seven miles further off at Calvisano<sup>9</sup> (quoted

<sup>7</sup> We cannot be sure that the Etruscan claims should be allowed in the case of *Magius*. It occurs in Etruria in both the Latin and the Etruscan forms. But in spite of this, it may well be purely Latin in all these examples.

<sup>8</sup> See Pedersen, I 96 f. The form *Maia* may, however, be entirely due to mediaeval scribes, who very commonly substituted *i* for *g*. Professor W. B. Anderson has kindly given me parallels from Lucan, MS. Z (ninth century), 1, 166 *fuitur* for *fugitur*, 6, 431 *maiorum* for *magorum*. The latter example is almost exactly parallel to *Maia* for *Magia*. Professor R. S. Conway has also given me similar examples from Livy MSS. of the tenth and eleventh centuries (e.g., *iero* for *gero*). I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my deep gratitude to Professor Conway and Professor Anderson, both of whom have read my paper in MS. and offered many valuable suggestions.

<sup>9</sup> Calvisano is thirty miles north-west of Mantua, a distance that corresponds exactly with Probus' 'xxx m. p. a Mantua distare'

<sup>1</sup> V 5105 (Inter Ollium et Sarium): *Magia Catulla*, 4990 (Riva): *Magius Magianus*, 6602 (Ager Novariensis): *P. Magius Messor*, 4483 (Brixia): *Magius Valerius Surio*, grandfather of *Primus Valerius Magirra*. In V 4642 (Brixia) we have a *L. Magius Primio*, husband of a Keltic woman, *Messia Atticilla*.

<sup>2</sup> See footnote 1, p. 105.

<sup>3</sup> One example may be quoted, V 5713 (Ager Mediolaniensis): *C. Atilius Mocetius* . . . *C. Atilio Magio fratri* . . . *et Surae Messoris f.* *Mocetius*, *Sura*, and *Messor* are Keltic names, and cf. *Magius Messor* in note 1 above.

<sup>4</sup> V 5567 (Infra Lacum Verbanum): *Samaus Taei f. et Banuca Magiaci f. uxor*, 6957 (Taurini): *T. Mattius Aleurti f. Magiacus*. Most of these names are clearly Keltic (see Holder for parallels).

<sup>5</sup> *Magilius* is also found once in *C.I.L.* XIV.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Vergilius*, *Vergius* : *uergo-* above, and the parallels quoted.



above). However, it would be fanciful to dwell on this point longer. Tradition will, no doubt, continue to assign to Pietole the honour of being the birth-place of the greatest Roman poet.

10. SILO occurs 10 times in *C.I.L.* V. The figures for the other volumes<sup>1</sup> are: IV 1, IX 3, X 3, XIV 1, II 24, III 4 (1 in Pisidia, 2 in Noricum), VII 1 (doubtful), XII 3, Brambach 2. The name is evenly distributed, though it preponderates in Keltic lands. Holder, II 1549, claims it, though with some hesitation, as a Keltic name. Schulze, pp. 232, 274 note 3, suggests a possible, though doubtful, connection with Etruscan parallels. Perhaps we are here again dealing with homonyms of different nationality. There can be little doubt that a Keltic name *Silo* did exist. One example, *C.I.L.* V 4958 (Camunni), makes this quite clear. We read there: *Tresus Endubronis*<sup>2</sup> f. *Tiro arbitratu Endubronis patris et Silonis et Secundi fratrum t(estamento) f(ieri) i(ussit)*. A strong point in favour of the view that it is Keltic is the fact that we find a form *Sila*, apparently serving as the feminine of *Silo*. *Sila* occurs twice in *C.I.L.* V, 3 times in II, i.e. we find the feminine *Sila* just in those two regions in which the masculine *Silo* is commonest. There can be no doubt about the Kelticity of *Sila*.<sup>3</sup> We find the same parallelism (masculine -o, -io: feminine -a, -ia) in other Keltic names, e.g., *Gallio*: *Gallia*, *Mascellio*:<sup>4</sup> *Mascellia* (*Gallio* and *Mascellio* are originally cognomina, which have been made to serve as nomina). In *C.I.L.* II 4069 *Sila* is the daughter of *Silo*. It must, however, be admitted that a cognomen *Silus* is found, though extremely rarely. Other parallels are *Silius*, *Silonius*, *Silonianus* (see Holder). Zeuss, *Gramm. Celt.*, p. 20, claims *Silo* as Keltic. Com-

(referring to Andes, the birthplace of Vergil). Pietole is barely three miles south-east of Mantua.

<sup>1</sup> See footnote 1, p. 105.

<sup>2</sup> *Endubro* is certainly Keltic (see Holder, I 1437).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. V 5883 (Mediolanum): *T. Pomponius Valentinus* . . . *C. Pomponio Fido patri et Viriae Virocanti f. Silae matri*. *Viria* and *Virocantis* are indisputably Keltic.

<sup>4</sup> The distribution of *Mascellio* proves it to be Keltic (see Holder under *Mascellio*).

plete certainty, however, cannot be attained in particular cases. We can only say that, judging by the distribution of the name and the parallelism between *Silo*: *Sila* both as regards stem and grammatical function, we must allow that a Keltic name *Silo* existed. In Gallia Cisalpina it is more likely to have been Keltic than Latin or Etruscan.<sup>5</sup>

11. ANDES (VICUS ANDICUS). Here at last we come to a name that can unhesitatingly be pronounced Keltic. Caesar mentions a tribe called *Andes* (short for *Andecavi*) in France, and there are countless other parallels<sup>6</sup> (see Holder, I 139 ff.).

12. To sum up: the evidence must be considered somewhat unsatisfactory; we can arrive at no demonstrable conclusion. All we can say is that the preceding investigation suggests the probability that *Vergilius* and *Maro* are Etruscan or Etruscan-Latin, though the former may well be Keltic, whereas *Magia* and *Silo* would appear to be probably Keltic, though a Latin (perhaps Etruscan) claim might also be allowed. The name of Vergil's birthplace, however, if that may be cited as evidence of his nationality, is certainly Keltic.

13. This hypothesis of a blend of Etruscan and Keltic blood is strongly supported by the poetry of Vergil. He was proud of the Etruscan origin of Mantua,<sup>7</sup> and had intimate knowledge of Etruscan character.<sup>8</sup> It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine all the Keltic traits in Vergil's poetry. They are many, and are well summed up by Pichon<sup>9</sup> in the following words: 'Celui qui a chanté la grandeur de

<sup>5</sup> There is some evidence also of an Oscan stem *sil-*; the leader of the Marsi in the Social War was called *Q. Pompaedius Silo*, and there was a large forest in Bruttium called *Sila* (cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 12, 715), whence perhaps the cognomen *Silanus* was derived.

<sup>6</sup> In *C.I.L.* V we find the following: *Andetiaca M.* f. *Galla*, *Andenius*, *Anderoudus*, *Andia*, *Andoblatio* (with *Atecingus* and *Deminca*), *Andovarto*; and in Pais, *Additamenta ad C.I.L.* Vol. V, *Andetius*, *Ando*.

<sup>7</sup> *Aen.* 10, 200 ff.

<sup>8</sup> E.g., *Mezentius* and *Arruns*; and cf. *Aen.* 11, 732 ff.

<sup>9</sup> René Pichon, *Histoire de la Littérature Latine*, pp. 328, 329.

Rome n'est pas un Romain, pas même un Italien; c'est un Cisalpin, en qui apparaissent quelques traits du génie celtique: la tendresse intime, la rêverie mélancolique et vague, la sympathie pour tous les êtres animés, et comme un sentiment confus de la vie universelle, la curiosité inquiète de l'avenir mystérieux.<sup>1</sup> The question of the nationality of Vergil cannot be decided with absolute certainty, and we must perforce be content with probabilities. Yet the sentences from the Introduction to Conington's *Vergil* quoted above are, owing to their brevity, somewhat misleading, and leave the impression that we are able to pronounce upon Vergil's nationality with a greater degree of certainty than is really the case. A more accurate statement as regards the actual occurrence of the names in inscriptions would be: '*Vergilius* is found comparatively seldom, *Magius* with extraordinary frequency in Cisalpine Gaul.'

Since the preceding account of the evidence for and against the Keltic claims to Vergil's names and person was written, Professor Conway has kindly lent me a dissertation by Ioannes Zwicker, *De Vocabulis et Rebus Gallicis siue Transpadanis apud Vergilium*, Lipsiae, MCMV, which also contains a chapter on the nationality of Vergil. Zwicker has no hesitation in claiming him as a Kelt outright. He has, however, interpreted the evidence in a very partial spirit. For example, he quotes Diefenbach, *Origines Europaeae*, and Du Cange, *Glossarium med. et inf. Latin.*, for the existence of certain *Marones*, apparently a class of Alpine guides: '*Marones enim appellantur uia-rum praemonstratores.*' But merely be-

cause these *Marones* lived in the Alps, he rashly concludes that both they and their name can be nothing but Keltic. They may have been, it is true; but the evidence is entirely insufficient. Zwicker also gives a table of figures showing the frequency of occurrence of the names *Vergilius*, *Maro*, etc., in the different volumes of the *C.I.L.* Unfortunately this table is for various reasons practically useless; indeed, it is very misleading. *C.I.L.* I, which Zwicker includes, is a collection of inscriptions arranged chronologically; the other volumes of the *C.I.L.* are arranged geographically and contain practically all the inscriptions of *C.I.L.* I in their proper geographical environment. Zwicker does not note this, and hence quotes many examples twice over. Further, in using the Indices to the different volumes of the *C.I.L.* he is inaccurate, and not infrequently counts the occurrence of the same man's name in different parts of the same inscription or in different inscriptions as two or more distinct examples of the name in question. One glaring example of this kind of inaccuracy may be quoted. In the Index to *C.I.L.* XIV we find under the cognomen *Maro*: '*MARO* (sic 256; 259) *siue* *MARON* (sic 268; 903), 268; 125; 256; 259; 903; 2973.' Zwicker actually quotes 10 examples of *Maro* from *C.I.L.* XIV! It does not inspire us with confidence in the author, when we find *Verg*[ ] (the stone is broken) quoted as a certain instance of *Vergilius*. How does Zwicker know that it should not be restored *Verginius*? Accuracy is the essence of an investigation based upon numerical comparison. Unfortunately Zwicker has not set himself a high standard in this respect, and his work is in consequence seriously vitiated.

G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Sellar, *Vergil*, pp. 104, 105, and Slater, *The Poetry of Catullus*, pp. 26-28.

*The University of Manchester.*

## NOTES

ARISTOTLE, *DE MUNDO*, 399a, 7.

σελήνη μὲν γὰρ ἐν μηνὶ τὸν ἑαυτῆς  
διαπεραίνεται κύκλον, αὐξομένη (v.l.  
αὐξανόμενη) τε καὶ μειουμένη καὶ  
φθίνουσα. . . .

We should expect the three participles in this sentence to refer to three different periods of the moon's monthly course. With the MSS. text this is not the case, for it is scarcely possible to differentiate between *μειουμένη* and *φθίνουσα* as waning and finally disappearing respectively.

It seems to me probable that *μειουμένη* is a corruption of *μεσουμένη*, which, again, may be a corruption of *μεσοῦσα*. It is natural to suppose that the writer had in mind the tripartite division of the month *μῆν ἰστάμενος, μῆν μεσῶν, μῆν φθίνων*. (Cf. also Theophr., *C. Pl.* ii. 4, 8. ἥλιον ἀνιόντα ἢ δυνόμενον ἢ μεσοῦντα of the sun's daily course.)

The only evidence proper for the form *μεσοῦσθαι* is Suidas' notice *μεσοῦται· πληροῦται*. Dindorf and Hase, however, suggested (Steph. Lex. s.v. *μεσοῦν*) with considerable plausibility that *μεσοῦται* there should be *μεσοῦνται*. It may be pointed out, though, that while *μεσοῦσθαι* could not normally be equivalent to *πληροῦσθαι*, nevertheless ἡ *σελήνη μεσοῦται* would be equivalent to ἡ *σελήνη πληροῦται*.

If, however, *μεσοῦσθαι* is a *vox nihili*, I think we should read here *μεσοῦσα* and assume that this became first *μεσουμένη* and then *μειουμένη*. A corruption of *-ομένη . . . -οῦσα . . . -ουσα* into *-ομένη . . . ουνμένη . . . -ουσα* is psychologically quite natural.

W. L. LORIMER.

*The University, St. Andrews.*ARISTOPHANES, *AVES*, 488-498.

THERE is, I think, an allusion in this passage that has been missed by scholars. I take it that l. 492 needs no alteration. To whom Pisthetaerus is referring in οἱ δ' is left vague by Aristo-

phanes, the remark being in reality introduced to give Euelpides an opening. Euelpides at once cites himself as an example of these 'others' who 'put on their shoes and go abroad while it is still night.' (That it is himself he is citing as a case in point and not the *λωποδύτης* whom he fell in with, is clear from the fact that in his story it is he and not the *λωποδύτης* who was awakened by the cock. Pisthetaerus' οἱ δ' were clearly people who were fetched out of their beds by the cock.) His tale is, I believe, intended as a parody of the story told<sup>1</sup> by the informer Dioclesides, of which we have an account in Andocides i. 37 sqq. Andocides says nothing, it is true, about a cock, but even if—a thing we need not assume—Dioclesides did not say that he was awakened by a cock, the general similarity of the narratives—the narrator in each case getting up during the night through a mistake as to the time, going out of doors, setting out for the country and falling in with criminals—is sufficient to justify us in supposing that Euelpides' tale is intended to recall Dioclesides' story.

The allusion is a veiled one, but so are all Aristophanes' allusions to the Hermocope and its sequel. Probably Syracosius' decree, the reality of which Mr. Rogers has in vain impugned, was simply an order forbidding allusions to this subject.

W. L. LORIMER.

*The University, St. Andrews.*NOTE ON THE PHRASE  
OPXAMOS ANAPWN.

ὄρχαμος, ὄρχατος are plainly connected with ὄρχος, and the notion that the first derives from ἄρχω should be abandoned. ὄρχος is a line with intervals; in military language, extended order. It is generally, but not inevit-

<sup>1</sup> Less than nine months before the production of the *Birds* (March, 414 B.C.).

ably, used of a line of trees, the Latin *quincunx*, and from this sense comes the secondary noun ὄρχατος, 'orchard.' But the verb ὀρχεῖσθαι, which is obviously formed from ὄρχος, would suggest another meaning for the primary noun and its derivative ὄρχαμος. The meaning of OPX-ος stands to that of XOP-ος—and the closely related χόρτος—as ὀρχεῖσθαι stands to χορεύειν. The latter verb with its noun is used of dancers arranged in close order in the ranks (cf. Lat. *cohors*, *hortus*): ὀρχεῖσθαι (and the meaning must be inherent in the noun from which it comes) is used of dancers in open order dancing independently. The dancer in a χόρος was one of a band; as ὄρχος or ὄρχαμος he had no one else to consider; he was 'premier sujet,' a Nijinsky or Mordkin. When the actor took the place of the solo dancer, the technical meaning of the word disappeared; but the champion who fought by himself in front of the line is his military equivalent, and ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν is 'first dancer of the company.'

As with so many technical words of music and the drama, the loss of meaning passed unnoticed, and the change is not so violent in Greek as it has been in English. 'Orchestral music' and 'choral music' should mean a 'pas seul' and a ballet: the history of the change is the history of the decadence of the dance.

F. A. WRIGHT.

*Birkbeck College.*

#### SOPHOCLES, *TRACHINIAE*, 331.

WHAT the poet actually wrote is so patent, as it seems to me, that one can but marvel at the many ineffectual attempts to mend the verse; but scholars here, as in so many other *loci conclamati*, have directed their efforts in the solution of the problem to the wrong part of the sentence: τοῖς οὖσι seemed to be so necessary to the thought that nobody suspected a 'corruptela.' These two words were originally one (οἷσσοι), which was read as οἷς οὖσι, and this naturally corrected to τοῖς οὖσι. That is the whole story.

Deianeira says: "Let her enter the house in silence,

μηδὲ πρὸς κακοῖς  
οἷσσοι λύπην πρὸς γ' ἐμοὶ λύπην λάβη."

Cp. Andoc. 2. 8 ἐγὼ τοίνυν ἐκ τῶν παρόντων ταῦτα ἃ ἐμοὶ μὲν λύπας ἐπὶ χρόνον πλείστον οἷσιν ἐμελλεν, Aesch. Fr. 177 τί γὰρ καλὸν ζῆν βίοτον, ὃς λύπας φέρει;

J. E. HARRY.

*University of Cincinnati.*

#### SABINUS' EDITION OF PERSIUS.

THROUGH the kindness of the Archivist I had recently a sight of the famous Persius Codex in the Archivio di S. Pietro at Rome (B of editors), and can now answer the question put in Vol. XIX. p. 465 (note) of the *Classical Review*. The Sabinus 'subscription' comes from the hand of the corrector (who has, e.g., inserted the omitted line 5, 18 'cum capite . . . noris') and not from the hand of the scribe. The mere appearance of the ink makes the difference of the two hands unmistakable. Similarly in the Montpellier 'frater gemellus' (A) of this MS. neither of the Sabinus 'subscriptions' seemed to me to be written by the scribe of the text. If that is so, the statement of all the editors of Persius from Jahn to Leo that AB represent Sabinus' text is a blunder. Some copy (now lost) of the Sabinus' text was used by the corrector of A and the corrector of B, two MSS. which must surely have been written in the same scriptorium, and it is not the text but merely their corrections which preserve a trace of Sabinus' editorship.

Mr. Owen, the only editor who seems to have really examined the Persius MSS. (unfortunately not the Basilicanus), pronounced (*Classical Review*, XIX. 220) one of the two 'subscriptions' in A, the one at the beginning of the text, to come from the corrector's hand, but not the other which stands at the end, and immediately follows the choliambi (the only 'subscription' found in B). My examination of A was



so hasty that I would not venture to question his verdict, were it not for the notorious difficulty in assigning with certainty a line of majuscule to a minuscule hand. And how can we believe that there were two copies of Sabinus' text in the scriptorium, one transcribed and one used for correction? The presence of two 'subscriptions,' one at the beginning, the other at the end of a text, is, of course, a quite natural feature. We find it, for example, in Martial (see my *Ancient Editions of Martial*, Appendix B). In fact, we get from Martial's *Xenia* an instructive parallel. For the preliminary 'subscription' stands at the beginning, not quite of the book, but rather of the actual text, after the prefatory matter (i.e. after 'Epigram iii.'). It reads: EMENDAVI EGO TORQVATVS GENNADIVS IN FORO DIVI AVGVSTI MARTIS CONSVLATV VINCENTII ET FRAGVITII (?) VIRORVM CLARISSIMORVM, while the 'subscription' at the end of the *Xenia* is: EMENDAVI EGO TORQVATVS GENNADIVS CVM CAETERIS GENNADI VATIBVS. QVIRINE FLOREAS. I would conjecture:

(1) That the displacement of the choliambic preface is an accidental error peculiar to the archetype of AB.

(2) That the choliambic preface occupied its proper place in the Sabinus text and was followed (like the prefatory matter in Martial's *Xenia*) by the Sabinus 'subscription' assigned to the beginning of the text. This is the 'subscription' inserted by the corrector of A and the corrector of B.

(3) That the displacement of the preface was the reason why the other Sabinus 'subscription,' that assigned to the end of the text, has not been inserted at all by the corrector of B and is crowded into the margin 'alieno loco' by the corrector of A. When the correctors took the Sabinus' exemplar to help them in correcting the transcript of the other exemplar, they began their comparison of the two at the choliambi, the first item in the Sabinus exemplar, the last item in the other exemplar. They inserted the majuscule passage. When they ended the comparison, they found a very similar majuscule passage. The corrector of B thought the insertion of it superfluous; the more conscientious corrector of A managed with some awkwardness to find room for it elsewhere. To write it beside the other majuscule passage was clearly impossible.

W. M. LINDSAY.

*St. Andrews.*

## REVIEWS

### BLACK GLAZE POTTERY FROM RHITSONA IN BOEOTIA.

*Black Glaze Pottery from Rhitsona in Boeotia.* By PERCY N. URE, M.A. (University College, Reading; Studies in History and Archaeology.) 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 64, with 19 plates, photographic. Oxford University Press: Humphrey Milford, 1913. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS learned and useful essay publishes another instalment of the results of excavation carried on by Professor R. M. Burrows and the author in 1907-8 on the site of Mykalessos in Boeotia.

NO. CCL. VOL. XXIX.

The graves in which this 'black glaze pottery' was found have been published already (*J.H.S.* 1909, *B.S.A.* 1909, 'Eφ. 'Apx. 1912), and the 'Corinthian' and 'Boeotian' fabrics from them have been discussed by Mr. Ure at some length. Now he gives us the 'black glaze kantharoi' of the sixth century B.C., and fifteen more graves, characterised by a series of 'black glaze drinking cups,' which he is led to assign to the fourth century; adding on pp. 58-61 an account of two inscriptions on stone from Rhitsona, some

fresh graffiti from the vases, and one painted maker's mark. The 'black-figured kylikes' for the most part still await their turn (p. 4, note), and there are more graves to come, from excavations in 1909.

The kantharoi, occurring in considerable numbers in the same graves as 'Boeotian' kylikes and the like, 'Corinthian' aryballoi, and 'black-figured' ware, are fairly accurately dated; though it does not seem quite certain that because there was only one skeleton (or not sufficient fragments to prove more than one) a grave had been only used once. Three and four hundred vases at one funeral seem more than ample equipment, and it would be arguing in a circle to say 'simply from the study of the pottery that each grave represents the vogue of some one definite moment' (p. 4), unless the fact of a single interment was independently established somehow. But the graves evidently cohere, and the total period which they represent is in any case not much more than half a century. The varieties of form and treatment which Mr. Ure discusses are therefore evidence rather of a multiplicity of concurrent types than of a long course of development; the two main types, deep and shallow, offering quite a number of interesting experiments and some curious hybrids. In view of what Mr. Ure says in another connexion (p. 33) about the significance of copious and jejune repertory, it looks as if these graves lay near to an active and spontaneous centre of manufacture, and as if this centre was still near the beginning of its productivity. Though he does not note them, Mr. Ure has probably taken into account the forms and the significance of kantharoi which appear on the coins of Haliartos and one or two other Boeotian cities, and at a later date on those of Mykalessos itself. They are the best evidence we have of the shapes of the metal kantharoi which so profoundly influenced the modelling of these clay ones.

It is a pity that fifth-century graves at Mykalessos have not been noted yet. Perhaps Mr. Ure's observations about the total lack of red-figured vases partly explain this (p. 36-38); villagers do not

always guide excavators to the most marketable tombs. In any case, there is at present a gap between the sixth-century tombs with kantharoi, and a fourth-century group characterised by other forms of black glaze ware. The significance of this copious fabric has been obscured by its lack of interest for 'collectors,' in which category we perforce include the great Museums and the 'learned' Societies which depend on showy finds for next year's income. The great opportunity, wholly missed, was in the necropolis of Marion in Cyprus (p. 34, note), and it would be interesting to test Mr. Ure's conclusions by the surviving tomb-groups in the Cyprus Museum. They certainly cover the period of the Mykalessian graves, and probably fill the fifth-century lacuna as well; for there were a fair number of tombs with red-figured vases, and some of the black glaze ware is of high quality. With the later kantharoi the Mykalessian coins already should be nearly contemporary, and there may be further evidence for date to be drawn from architectural and other non-ceramic palmettes.

Mr. Ure's treatment of these later graves is very careful and detailed, and his conclusions may be accepted as a contribution to a very ill-studied branch of Greek technology. But there is clearly much more to be done before we have the ceramic commentary on Boeotian federalism and on Boeotian relations with Macedon, which he forecasts so temptingly on pp. 2 and 39. For the late fifth century, too, the wholesale desertion of slaves (mainly industrial) from Athens, gains new significance if Boeotian potters were working so well and copiously just over the border. And such commentary can only be done by small persistent enterprises on second-class sites, and by microscopic commentary such as this. It is work, however, which can be done with small funds and a small staff; and it is just this kind of opportunity which the University College at Reading has been lucky enough to seize in publishing this monograph of its Professor of Classics.

Small queries and corrections befit so minute a study! Is there no English



for *Westabhang, dipinti, lacrymateria*? Should not Grainger (p. 39) be Graindor, and 'convex' (p. 30, about Pl. xi. 7) be 'concave'? And what is the chemistry

of the procedure on p. 19 for making pots red inside? One would expect the reverse effect.

JOHN L. MYRES.

### THE BEGINNING OF LIFE.

Galenus qui fertur libellus EI ΖΩΙΩΝ ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΓΑΣΤΡΟΣ. Dissertatio inauguralis, etc., Sc. HERMANNUS WAGNER. Arnsbergiensis, Marburgi Chattorum. MCMXIV. Typis Roberti Noske Bornensis.

WHEN by some strange emancipation, which is hard to explain, the vision of the Ionian sages was cleared of supernatural phantasy, and looked out over the world with imagination and reason unclouded, no function of nature was to them more marvellous, and none more perplexing, than *motion*. The stone which the philosopher threw into the air derived its impetus from his hand; but whence and how was generated the force which played through the animal body? And, as insight grew quicker and deeper, as behind massive motion a molecular activity, a universal swarming of atoms, was discerned, the more intense became the question of the source of this all-pervading and stupendous energy? It could not lie merely in nutrition, for, as Aristotle not unnaturally demurred, if so, trees would develop limbs and walk about.

The doctrine of the *pneuma*, in its origin, is almost mythological; even for the Stoic divinity was still a fiery and intelligent *pneuma* pervading the universe. In Ionian philosophy *pneuma* was a hypothetical entity, identified in the first instance with the respiratory function—the breath of life. And, if some aquatic animals did not breathe, well, it was truly observed that water contained air, and respiration was not only by lungs, but also, as was supposed even in man himself, by the skin. Thus, not unlike our modern hypothesis of the ether, the *pneuma* was the cause, source, or vehicle of all activity—molecular first and then massive. For readers of this Review it is needless to

qualify this general conception, this fundamental hypothesis, of the *pneuma*; or to trace the various kindred speculations of various philosophers through all possible conceptions of *pneuma*, as in its finest atoms *psyche*, in its coarser atoms *pepsis*, and so on; nor need we stop to consider the identity or analogy of *pneuma* with exhalation, with the air itself ('beseelte Luft'), with fire, or with a spirit near to fire—ideas which signified a passionate attempt of thought to seize the secret of oxygen, in those days impenetrable.

Until yesterday all thinkers regarded dynamics as a drama of entities: we have but just ceased—not quite ceased perhaps, to speak of electricity as a fluid: so, for early thinkers, heat and cold, weight and levity, and so on, were likewise entities; thus for Greek philosophers *pneuma* was an entity. But, in the animal for instance, how did it come there? Did it begin of itself, or was it bestowed upon the animal at a certain stage, and, if so, at what stage? Thus we find such treatises as this before us, the questioning of earnest men anxiously discussing at what stage *pneuma* enters the embryo—*πῶς ἐμφυοῦται τὰ ἔμβρυα*; and books we find with such titles as this—*Is, and when is, the fruit of the womb endowed with this vital principle?* Is the *pneuma* or some quality of it, *σύμφυτον*, or is it altogether or in some measure *ἐπίσπικτον*? When does the *ζῶον* become an *οὐσία ἐμφυτος αἰσθητική*? Does the potential substance become alive by the infusion of the semen? By doubts such as these the Church of Rome is disturbed to this day. As in this treatise (III. 24) it is held *τρέφεται μὲν γὰρ ψυχή πνεύματι*, it may well be asked when either begins?

The Dissertation before us contains a revised text of the treatise, with concise and (so far as I can tell) scholarly

notes, variorum and exegetic. In an Introduction the editor discusses the MSS. in a manner which seems to me careful and complete; but of his readings and conjectural emendations I am no sufficient judge.

I pass on to the enquiry if the treatise has been rightly attributed to Galen? The MSS. all assume this attribution, and Psellus was of this opinion. The Aldine editor, however, hesitated, and, following him, later editors, for the most part, have regarded the book as spurious. However, some recent commentators have sought to restore it to Galen. If from the hand of Galen himself, the tract would carry a certain authority; moreover, in this case, we could place it more exactly in its order in the history of knowledge. In any case, of course, an attempt has to be made to find such a place for it.

But the attribution to Galen cannot stand; the editor of the Dissertation repeats good reasons for the denial. The author, for instance, is something of a rhetorician—he appeals to hearers; Galen always wrote for readers. The composition appears to be one of the medical ‘Addresses’ which were frequently delivered by physicians of the period when entering upon a new office, or seeking election to office. Not a few of these are extant, one or two are in the Hippocratic corpus. We know, for instance, that such competitive addresses, by candidates for medical office, were held in Ephesus. (The editor refers on this point also to Keil J. Jhft. d. österr. arch. Inst. in Wien, Bd. viii., 1905.) Again, the address before us is more epideictic in style than was customary with Galen, who either argued

more carefully from facts or confessed his ignorance; whereas this author is often trivial, careless, and even absurd. Furthermore, he advocates opinions which we know not to have been those of Galen; in the matter before us he differs from Galen as to the moment of first animation. For Galen this was the *punctum saliens*, or first circulatory pulsation; for this author it was the moment of insemination. He also believed that the foetus in utero was nourished by its mouth, and breathed by its mouth.<sup>1</sup> Galen, on the contrary, gave these functions to the umbilical veins. Again, Galen was prone to quotation from himself; in this treatise there is no allusion to Galen. Finally, Galen avoided hiatus; this author does not: Galen used *πᾶς* after vowels, *ἅπας* after consonants; the author of this treatise observes no such rule.

If we try to go beyond these negative tests, we find no evidence of the date, place, or quality of the author; as to the problems he discussed, they were commonplaces of controversy for many generations.

This Dissertation is a very creditable piece of work, and, so far as it goes, a valuable contribution towards the complete edition of Galen which is so much to be desired.

P.S.—The first volume of *Galen* in the series of the Academic Corpus Medicorum Graecorum has just reached us; we purpose to give some notice of it in a later number of the *Classical Review*.

CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

<sup>1</sup> Alcmaeon of Croton held this curious opinion, as did no less a person than Democritus, and so later Epicurus.

#### THE ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE NEAR EAST, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE BATTLE OF SALAMIS.

*The Ancient History of the Near East, from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Salamis.* By H. R. HALL, M.A., F.S.A. With 33 plates and 14 maps. Methuen.

I HAVE always felt a respect for the Oxford Greats man, and now I feel

something more like awe. This book, which I have had in my hands for some months—not indeed studying it continuously, but reading regularly as much as my mind could take in—is meant, as the author tells us, ‘mainly for the use of students in the school of Litterae Humaniores at Oxford, whose work

necessitates a competent general knowledge of the early history of the West-Oriental world, without which the history of Greece cannot be understood fully.' I took up the book with joy, hoping that even thus late in life, a second Cato, I might repair some of the disadvantages of my more rigid training. I read it also with a measure of joy, which soon quickened into the more salutary spirit of chastened awe. If the students in the school of Litt. Hum. can put away all this as a sort of savoury, before setting to at their square meal, in which Greek history is only one course, never talk to me of English degeneracy or soft options. The savoury includes archaic Egypt and archaic Greece, Egypt old, middle, and new, the Hyksos conquest and the empire, Babylonia, the Hittite Kingdom, Syria and Palestine, and the Medes and Persians. To this reader at least, it seems as though nothing can have been left out which can be of any importance; while the arrangement and the correlation of the parts make the material as clear as such a history can be. The author also seems to be judicious and not given to speculation; although to a Cambridge mind he gives a mild surprise when he accepts the fanciful theories built up on the 'double axe.'

Apart from the bare facts of history, names and dates, and the discussion of royal lists, which are given with care and lucidity, the book contains much that deserves the attention of students in other schools than the school of Litt. Hum. There is pottery, for one thing. We cannot get away from pottery in these days, and the imagination is struck by a history which takes us back to a time when the potter's wheel went not round, nor was his furnace kindled. What a genius was he who invented the potter's wheel! Pottery is one of the most important aids to dating, if due precautions be taken: and the student is properly directed to this. Then dress, again, hair fashions and headgear, the Cretan boot; burial customs; even in this condensed chronicle there is room for such topics as these. One might doubt however, if arguments can always be based on the absence of dress (p. 32); woad would not seem to our notions

enough for an inclement climate like England, if we argued from probabilities. The history of art is also full of surprises: well may Mr. Hall say that modern engineers could not do better than the builders of the Pyramids, three thousand years before Christ. What is said here about the various kinds of art is not much in proportion to the rest, but it whets the appetite. But most striking of all is the power of that one art which in those great nations, except Greece, was absent. Spells there are, and laws, letters and contracts, a few tales, and one really beautiful poem is given (p. 306), but how dead is the picture of ancient life as a whole! A few men stand out as great conquerors; but very few take on a human semblance, and they only by induction from their deeds. One such from the early period is Khasekhem (p. 111); another, less clear, Pepi II., who reigned ninety-four years—the longest reign in history. More is known of some later persons: Sargon, Khammurabi, Thothmes III.; Akhenaten, whom Mr. Hall unkindly calls the 'first prig' in history. But what shadows they all are at best! *Carent vate sacro*. When we come to Assyria, there is the Old Testament to help us. When all is said, however, the history of Greece seems to be all in daylight, these other countries in the dark. If the Egyptians had had the art of expression, we might have cared for many of them in our hearts as we care for Achilles and Hector—for surely Achilles and Hector were real men once, under whatever name they went, as real as that crabbed old Hesiod. But no litterae humaniores shed their light over Egypt, and for me at least her monuments may be magnificent, but do not touch the heart.

I fear this is a digression. It is no fault of Mr. Hall's if the Nearer East produced only one literature, and for his work no student can fail to be grateful. The student in the school of Litt. Hum. may (I only say may) take the book to Blackwell's when he gets his first, but I shall put it upon my shelf, and whenever I want to know anything about the Near East I will draw this covert first.

W. H. D. R.

## NAZARETH AND THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY.

*Nazareth and the Beginnings of Christianity: A New View based upon Philological Evidence.* By CHAMPLIN BURRAGE. 8vo. Pp. 68. Oxford and London: Humphrey Milford, 1914. 3s. 6d.

THE remainder of the title runs thus: *With critical appendices, including unnoticed pre-canonical readings; a discussion of the birthplace of Jesus, and the text of what is believed to be the hitherto undiscovered source of the prophecy, that the Messiah 'should be called a Nazarene.'* In the course of this short pamphlet (the body of the book, excluding appendices, only amounts to 19 pages), the Librarian of Manchester College, Oxford, has boldly tackled one of the hardest problems of all that confront the student of Christian origins—namely, the meaning of the terms *Ναζαρηνός* and *Ναζωραῖος*. The task is difficult, and requires a scholar who can add to the ordinary equipment a knowledge of Semitic languages and archaeology. If Mr. Burrage comes to the work with insufficient preparation, as in our opinion is the case, the courage of the attempt should yet be recognised, as also the stimulating character of much that he writes.

The problem may be briefly sketched as follows: As early as Acts xxiv. 5 the Christians were known as *Ναζωραῖοι*. The author of Acts apparently uses *Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνός* and *Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος* as interchangeable terms, see Luke iv. 34 and xviii. 37. *Ναζωραῖος* cannot possibly be connected with Nazareth for linguistic reasons. No satisfactory explanation has yet been given of the *ω* sound, which also occurs in the Jewish adjective *Nōsrī* applied to Christians. There are further difficulties connected with Nazareth, which throw grave doubt on its identification. What is meant by the reference to prophecy in Matt. ii. 23 is also disputed (*Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται*). Most of the data come from Epiphanius in the fourth century. There are further factors which cannot be discussed here. When it is remembered that, with the exception of the

Gospels and a casual note in Acts, early Christian literature is silent on the subject of Galilee, and also that the most far-reaching change in the history of the Church, the migration from Galilee to Jerusalem, took place at a period which eludes our gaze, the fundamental importance of the issues involved will become evident.

Mr. Burrage's theory seems to be that *Ναζαρηνός* meant an inhabitant of Nazara or Nazareth, which was a district the other side of Jordan to which the Christians fled before A.D. 70 (the geographical proofs here are very slender), while *Ναζωραῖος* meant belonging to the Messiah (Hebrew *Nēser*—i.e., 'the Branch,' see Isa. xi. 1), and then by confusion the same as *Ναζαρηνός*. The spelling *Ναζωραῖος* in place of *Νασωραῖος* was due to the influence of Judg. xiii. 5, *ναζειρ θεοῦ ἔσται τὸ παιδάριον*, as seen in Matt. ii. 23. This latter passage is the 'discovery' alluded to on the title-page. Mr. Burrage says on p. 41: 'No one seems to have noticed this point. . . . How these eminent critics and theologians' (i.e., apparently Epiphanius, Jerome, and Mr. F. C. Conybeare) 'could have missed this point it is difficult to understand.' However, the point is noted in Gressmann's Commentary on St. Matthew (1909, in Lietzmann's *Handbuch*) and presumably elsewhere. The marginal note to Matt. ii. 23 in a copy of the Authorised Version which has belonged to the reviewer for thirty years is 'see Judg. xiii. 5'!

Among the various objections that may be raised against Mr. Burrage's reconstructions the most serious perhaps are those connected with the transliteration into Greek of Semitic names. These have been treated at some length in long reviews of this book written by two well-known Syriac scholars, Professor Burkitt and Dom Connolly, in the *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, June, 1914, and the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1914, respectively. Reference may also be made to an article by Chr. Bugge



of Christiania in the *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1913, p. 145 ff., in which the author concludes that in early days the Christians were identified with the Nazoraeans, who in their turn were identical

with the *bürgerlich* type of Essenes—those, that is, who lived in the towns as a sort of Third Order as opposed to the desert-dwellers or Essenes proper.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

*Cavendish, Suffolk.*

### LATIN SYNTAX.

1. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Von R. KÜHNER. Second edition. Vol. II.: *Satzlehre*, Part ii., neubearbeitet von C. STEGMANN. Pp. viii + 738. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1914. M. 16.50; bound, M. 18.50.
2. *Syntax of Early Latin*. By C. E. BENNETT. Vol. I.: *The Verb*. Pp. xx + 506 (1910). Vol. II.: *The Cases*. Pp. x + 409. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6" (1914). Boston: Allyn and Bacon. \$4 each volume.

Of the new edition of Kühner it is not necessary to speak at length, because the work has already been described in this *Review*. The first volume (price 24s.), dealing with Formenlehre, etc., has not been well revised for the new edition, and cannot be recommended (see *C.R.* XXVI., 1912, pp. 200 ff.). The second volume, which treats of the Syntax, consists of two parts, of which the first (price 18s., 828 pp.) was noticed in *C.R.* XXVII., 1913, pp. 104 f., and the second is now before us. The reviser, C. Stegmann, has an intimate knowledge of Latin syntax (especially the syntax of Cicero and Caesar) and an extensive acquaintance with the recent literature of the subject. He has done his work well. I have compared the new edition with the old in a large number of sections, and have found again and again evidence of careful revision. Incorrect statements have been put right: e.g. Kühner says there is a Passive Future Subjunctive, *non dubito quin futurum sit ut laudare*; Stegmann rightly says that this is not Latin, and shows (p. 181) how the Romans expressed their meaning without such a periphrasis. The most recent texts have been used for the examples; in this second part Cicero's philosophical writings are cited from

Plasberg's edition, his speeches from the Oxford text. Above all, the information is fuller; so much so that the Syntax 'volume,' if we reckon its two parts together, has 400 pages more than in the old edition. The quotations and references are more numerous and more carefully selected. The passages quoted are generally sufficient if one wants to find quickly a good set of typical instances; if one wishes to go more fully into any subject the references are helpful; they often include a good hint such as cp. Madvig, *de Fin.*, or Lebreton's book on Cicero, which means that further evidence is collected in the place referred to. I have noted few misprints. On p. 406 the reference to Terrell's article (on *scripturum fuisse* as the regular oblique form of *scriberem*) should read *American Journal of Philology*, 1904, not 1894. In a book of this size the Index is all-important. I have tested it from time to time for some months, and have almost always found what I was in search of within a few minutes. As, besides the Index of Subjects, there is a very full Index of Latin words, the book will be useful to many who do not know German well. As a general reference book for Latin syntax from Plautus to Tacitus, and especially for the language of the time of Cicero and Augustus, it is and long will be the best of its kind.

For a fuller study of Early Latin the student will turn to Professor Bennett's handsome volumes.

Professor Bennett takes 100 B.C. as his later limit, and has 'endeavoured to consider all the remains of any syntactical significance from the earliest period down to this time.' 'Had I extended the scope of my work,' he continues, 'for another quarter of a

century, the additions would have been insignificant—merely a few citations from the Sullan annalists and contemporary inscriptions.' As a matter of fact, he would have included some of Cicero's early work, a very interesting addition, differing in kind from any of the literature here studied.

In the Preface to Vol. I. it is stated that the 'concluding portion of the work' will treat the Cases, the Adjectives, the Pronouns, and the Particles. In the Preface to Vol. II., which treats the Cases, nothing is said of any further instalment.

The most notable point about Professor Bennett's work is that he has aimed at making his record of examples a very full one. Unless he tells us to the contrary, either by putting '*e.g.*' or 'frequent' before his examples, or by giving in parenthesis the number of occurrences, his quotations and references 'are intended to represent the complete material belonging under the given topic.' This completeness seems to me a great advantage, though there are a few places (for instance, II. 37-50, the 'Possessive Genitive' strictly so-called) where it has seemed doubtful whether a selection would not have been equally useful. But, as he says, 'it is impossible to foresee what particular information the student may seek in a syntactical manual.' The book will no doubt be used mainly for reference. In so using it one must be careful not to suppose that a set of examples is intended to be complete unless one has read the whole section in which they occur. It may happen that a statement to the effect that only a selection is given has been made some pages back. The writer thinks of his readers as going through the pages continuously: *e.g.* anyone in search of expressions like *Rhodo mercator* might be puzzled by the classification of the Ablative of Separation (II. 280). He would note, 'A. Uses with Verbs. B. With Adjectives and Adverbs,' and would be surprised not to find 'With Nouns.' Perhaps he would turn to 'D. Proper names designating place,' but he would not find his example here under 'Names of Islands.' If he persisted he would find the paragraph he

was in search of at the end of the section, printed without a heading, so that it seems to belong to 'Names of Rivers and Nations.' In some places where the evidence is apparently intended to be complete I have noted omissions: for instance, in I. 426, 'Present Infinitive with future force,' add *Asin.* 699, and, a very good example, *Most.* 633, *dic te daturum, ut abeat. Th. egon dicam dare?* II. 384, 'Ablative of Time within Which,' add *Bacch.* 422, *nego tibi hoc annis viginti fuisse primis copiae . . . pedem ut efferres aedibus.*

But the book is not merely a repertorium in which one can find, and generally find easily, abundant examples of any usage. The exposition is valuable and interesting. The author writes clearly and vigorously; he has read widely in grammatical literature and formed very definite opinions on the various questions involved; when there is any need he sets out fully and sometimes at considerable length the reasons in favour of the principle of classification which he adopts. A quotation may give some idea of the quality of his work:

'We cannot bear too closely in mind that, while the great mass of all syntactical constructions falls naturally into large groups of closely related uses, yet this condition was not original. At the outset there was greater variety and flexibility than later. With time the crystallisation into related groups of uses advanced further and further. Yet there always remained traces of the earlier freedom, many uses lying quite outside the clearly marked formal categories, others hovering between two related groups. This principle applies not only to the Genitive and other cases, but to the moods and tenses as well. To ignore it is to reverse the order of syntactical development, and to represent as primitive what was a matter of growth' (II. 11 f.).

That is well put. I hope I may not seem hypercritical if I raise objection to the author's occasional use, when there is no need of them, of German technical words in the midst of an English sentence: *e.g.* 'There was no "einheitlicher" Genitive in the *Ursprache*' (II. 10). And is it pedantic



to protest against the careless use of 'after' and 'with'? II. 294, 'The Ablative is the regular construction after comparatives in negative expressions.' (The examples show that 'before' would be rather more suitable: *hoc nemo doctior* shows the more usual order.) II. 299, 'Accusative of Inner Object with Neuter Pronouns': e.g. *si quid erro*. Why deprive 'with' of its sociative force? It is curious by the way that in a book devoted to the careful study of language, and especially of the cases, our own case-phrases should be used somewhat loosely.

Professor Bennett's explanations generally carry conviction. In one place he seems to me to adopt a very improbable account of the origin of a construction. II. 298 he says that the 'Ablative of Time after Which . . . seems to exist by implication in the omitted antecedent of the relative in such expressions as Ter. *And. 104, in diebus paucis quibus haec acta sunt*; Cic. *R. A. 20, quadriduo quo haec gesta sunt, res ad Chrysogonum defertur*.' This latter 'passage means "within four days from what time these things took place," i.e. *quo* is here equivalent to *ab eo tempore quo* (the antecedent of *quo* obviously cannot be *quadriduo*). In the Terence passage and other similar passages he thinks we have 'a case of formal attraction merely. In strictness the correct form would have been: *paucis diebus quo*, i.e. *paucis diebus (ab eo tempore) quo*, but the analogy of *quadriduo quo* (which must represent the origin of our idiom) would naturally lead to a *paucis diebus quibus*, when the antecedent was plural. [Note that B. calls *diebus* the antecedent to *quibus*, which

is inconsistent with the statement about *quadriduo*.] In other words, the Romans themselves seem with time to have lost consciousness of the true nature of the idiom.' Is there not a more natural explanation, one which involves no such assumptions? The 'Ablative of Time within Which' is, as Professor Bennett says, 'a direct outgrowth of the Ablative of Time at Which.' They shade off into one another, so that *uno die* may mean 'on a single day' or 'in the course of a single day.' Hence such a sentence as *Diebus X, quibus materia coepta erat comportari, omni opere effecto exercitus traducitur* (Caes. *B.G. IV. 18, 1*) does not seem different in type from *Eodem die illum vidi quo te*. Compare the English 'I saw him in the course of the same day that I saw you' with 'In the course of the ten days in which the collection of the timber began the whole structure was finished, etc.' The meaning is not 'ten days after,' but 'not more than ten days after,' 'within the ten days.'

I have called attention to a few points in which the book might perhaps be improved in a second edition. But none of these is of any great importance. It will be useful, not only to those who are working specially at Early Latin, but also to those whose main interests are in the later literature. There are, of course, differences between the syntax of Plautus and that of Cicero, but the main features of the language are the same. It is a great satisfaction to have in English a work on this scale to which one can turn for evidence in case of doubt.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

*St. Paul's School.*

#### DE NUGIS CURIALIUM.

Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*.  
Edited by MONTAGUE RHODES JAMES.  
(Anecdota Oxoniensia). Oxford, 1914.

THE *editio princeps* of Map's book, *On the Trifling Pursuits of Courtiers*, was published in 1850 for the Camden Society by Thomas Wright from the only MS.

known—one of the late fourteenth century, which belonged to John Wells, a monk of Ramsey, known as an opponent of Wycliffe, and in his day Prior of the students at Gloucester Hall in Oxford. This MS. is now in the Bodleian Library. Sixty-four years later, the Provost of King's has presented us with

a new edition. The text is vastly improved; but it is disappointing that Dr. James should not have seen his way to giving us, out of his stores of legendary lore, a fuller commentary upon the contents.

Map borrowed the title of his book, but apparently nothing else, from the *Policraticus* of John of Salisbury. He compiled it, as Dr. James shows (p. xxvii) between 1180 and 1194, and incorporated in it an earlier and much more widely popular work of his own, the *Epistle of Valerius, dissuading Ruffinus from Marriage*. Written in a somewhat difficult Latin, the *Distinctiones quinque de Nugis Curialium* are full of curious information; of legends, Welsh and other (Map lived near the Welsh border), and of interesting sidelights thrown on contemporary history from his personal experience. In the present review I shall mainly confine myself to observations on the text and on the use of older authors.

On p. 3 Dr. James's suggestion that *coruis* and *cervis* should be transposed is supported not only by the medieval verses to which his note refers, but by the original passage in Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* vii. 153. On p. 73 Dr. James notes that the MS. reads *brekeniauc* for Brekeniauc; but he does not mention that it also gives the last syllable of other Welsh names in the immediate context, *Wastiniauc*, *Nagelauc*, and *Madauc*—as *anc*. In a note on the margin of the Bodleian copy of Wright's edition, Dr. J. Gwenogvryn Evans conjectures that *Lenem* in the same passage should be *Levem*, and identifies (no doubt correctly) this *aqua uicina stagno Brekeniauc* with the Llyfni river, which issues from Brecknock Mere and runs into the Wye. He would also read (I do not know on what grounds) *Uagelauc* for *Nagelauc*.

Dr. James has proposed a number of excellent emendations in the text of the MS. I should like to venture on a few additional suggestions of my own. I have in every case verified Dr. James's readings in the MS. On p. 26. 4, I would read *auarissime* for *amarissime*, on p. 87. 18 *uirgini* for *origini* (I cannot understand the sentence as it stands; the 'virgin' intended, if my emendation

be right, I should guess to be St. Catherine of Alexandria, *cuius ortu decorata gloriatur Graecia*, as the sequence in the Sarum missal says). P. 155. 4 (in the *Epistle to Valerius*, where the text of the Bodleian MS. can be checked by other MSS.) the reading given by Dr. James as that of DT, *humilis*, is surely right. Moreover, I should not wonder if this were the original reading of the Bodleian MS. The word as it stands has certainly been partially rewritten in much later ink. The marginal alternative to *sullimis*, which Dr. James reads (with a query) as *similis*, I cannot so interpret; I think it is *suilinus* (= *suillinus*), and I take it that this word (= piggish, unclean) was read instead of *sullimis* by those who read *mundus* (= pure) instead of *humilis*; it would thus be equivalent in sense to *incestus* in the preceding clause; but *humilis* and *sullimis* give a much better sense. On p. 159. 18 the sense clearly demands the omission of *et Filio*. On p. 242. 10 if Dr. James's correction *soluisset* for *soluit* be accepted, I should also read *alius* for *aliquis*. But the sense may be 'Perhaps there are kings who don't pay their just debts,' with a hit at an individual, possibly Richard I. (who seems to me far more likely than his father to be the *Appollonides* of p. 205. 4). On p. 243. 30, I should read *delictum* for *delicti*.

Dr. James has supplied in many cases the sources of direct quotations; to these may be added Ps. i. 4 for *Non sic impii, non sic* on p. 130. 16. No suggestion is made as to the reference to St. Gregory on p. 24. 10. If nothing nearer can be found, I would propose *Moral.* vii. 1. 2. Dacianus, on p. 46, is the magistrate under whom St. Vincent suffered martyrdom. The expression *homo nauci* (p. 92) Map had presumably come across in Priscian (I. 204). It is more difficult to guess whence he knew of the word *nefrendem* (p. 207. 19), his explanation of which (*adolescentem et virginem suam*) differs somewhat from that found in the passages of classical authors in which it is known to occur—none of them, moreover, likely to have been within his knowledge. With the quotation from the *Didache* on p. 146. 18 cp. Abelard, *Serm. de Eleemosyna* (ed. Cousin, i. p. 552). On p. 205. 7 the reference to

Virgil *Ecl.* viii. 10, might have been added.

One or two observations may be added, suggested by the few—the tantalizingly few—notes which Dr. James has given us. On 20. 27 Dr. James tells us that he has been unable to find in Richard Simon's *Novae observationes ad text. et verss. N.T.*, cap. 20, a passage to which Fabricius refers for a treatment of the quotation, *In quacunq[ue] hora ingemuerit peccator, saluus erit*. But Fabricius is merely referring to a remark of Simon's in the chapter in question to the effect that Lucifer of Cagliari (by whom, says Fabricius, the text is quoted and attributed to Ezekiel) often confirms the readings of the Codex Bezae. If Fabricius however is, as I suppose, referring to the passage of Lucifer quoted in the same note by Dr. James, he expresses himself badly. For Lucifer merely cites without naming the writers, first the old version of Isa. xxx. 15, and then Ezek. xxxiii. 12. Dr. James regards *In quacunq[ue] hora*, etc., as a reminiscence of the latter passage coloured by the former; I should have put it the other way round.

Dr. James's footnote to p. 61.7 is misleading. The objection to the Waldensian's saying, *Credimus in matrem Christi*, was surely not that 'the phrase was Nestorian,' but that it placed the Virgin Mary on a level with the Persons of the Trinity. On 157. 16 it would have been clearer to explain that in St. Jerome the treatise of Theophrastus on marriage is merely called *aureolus Theophrasti liber* (T.'s golden little book), whence Aureolus came by misunderstanding to be regarded as its proper name. On 177. 3 I imagine that (as, I gather from Dr. James' note, Liebrecht thought) *matre morphoseos* is merely a mistake for *metamorphoseos*, used as the rule of Apuleius' *Golden Ass*. I should be inclined to translate: 'taught by the "Metamorphoseos" (*sic*) he consents through a drug of his own administering to forget his usual way of life.' The MS., by the way, has *edoctus*, not *doctus*.

*Haurit ex apotheca Scille furorem* in the preceding line is a reference to Ovid, *Metam.* xiii. 967. On 207. 10 it is curious that Dr. James should not have noted that Map, in saying that Ethelred II. was called *consilium* 'quia nullius erat negocii,' as one who was always deliberating, and never acted, inverts the usual story that he was called *Unready*, because he lacked *rede* or counsel. In 242. 16 I feel sure that the MS. has *stannum* (as Wright read), and not *stancium*, as Dr. James thinks.

I have noticed three trifling misprints: 'frequentur' for 'frequenter,' p. 24. 5; '1 Reg.' for '2 Reg.' in the marginal reference, p. 237. 9; 'III' for 'III18' in the reference to Fabricius on p. 263.

Resisting the temptation, as leading me beyond the sphere of the *Classical Review*, to dwell on the evidence supplied by Map that 'German militarism' was a familiar theme in the twelfth century, and that our pacifists would have found a sympathiser in Louis the Fat of France, if not in Map himself, I will end by calling attention to a curious observation of our author's on the spelling of *euangelium*. As is well known, this word was generally at that date written a double *u* in the first syllable; and Map remarks of the cynical verse, *Iupiter esse pium statuit quodcumq[ue] iuaret: Hoc est zabuli* (i.e. Diaboli) *sic euangelium ab Euan, u consonante, quod est furor interpretatum (unde Bachus Euan dicitur) non Euuangelium Domini Ihesu, posito bis v. vocali, ab eu, quod est bonum, quod abstinentiam docet a malis et in bonis instanciam*. This attempt to distinguish two spellings as appropriate to a good and bad sense of the word is parallel with Hugh of St. Victor's attempt to distinguish *mathesis* and *matesis*, or John of Salisbury's to distinguish *máthesis* and *mathésis* on the same principle; see my note on John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, i. 9.

C. C. J. WEBB.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

## CICERO OF ARPINUM.

*Cicero of Arpinum.* By E. G. SIHLER,  
Ph.D. Yale University Press, 1914.  
10s. 6d.

PROFESSOR SIHLER describes his work as 'a contribution to the history of ancient civilisation and a guide to the study of Cicero's writings.' The first claim is somewhat ambitious, but the second, apart from some reservations, is well justified. The writer knows his Cicero well, and has read a large number of monographs. Also, what is more important, his judgment of Cicero's character is well balanced and sane. He rejects indignantly the caricatures of Dio Cassius, Drumann, and Mommsen, while he does not indulge in undue laudation. His industry is beyond reproach, and his enthusiasm for his subject is refreshing. As a catalogue of facts his work possesses high merit, though sometimes the facts are not well arranged. Thus on p. 273 he refers to the withdrawal of Appius to the opposite end of his province after the arrival of Cicero in Cilicia and his holding of assizes there. This he calls a curious form of double administration. The explanation, viz. that under a law of Sulla an outgoing governor had thirty days of grace, is not given until the next page. Sometimes the meaning is not clear. Thus on p. 15 we read 'Drusus then strove to deprive the equestrian class of that grossly abused monopoly' (the control of the *indicia*) 'by putting some three hundred of the most worthy Knights into the great council.' The reader will wonder how the transference of three hundred equites to the Senate could deprive the equestrian order of its privilege. Professor Sihler gives no explanatory note. It would have been well to indicate the difficulties in the statements of our authorities. Now and then Professor Sihler is a little behind the times. Thus (p. 344) he says that Cicero believed in the 'occasional' use of rhythm, but not in 'an endless sing-song of Gorgian mellifluence.' There are two ingredients in prose rhythm—viz. cadences (*numeri*) and balance

(*concininitas*). Cicero employed *numeri* always, *concininitas* on occasions only. The first of these was, as the ancients said, 'invented' by Thrasyarchus, the second corresponds to the *σχήματα* of Gorgias. The term 'mellifluous' is suitable for the metrical cadences of Thrasyarchus, not for the balanced antitheses of the Sicilian. It is somewhat surprising to find that Asconius is quoted from Orelli-Baiter (1845). If Professor Sihler does not know of Stangl (1912), has he not used Kiessling and Schöll (1875)? It is a moot point whether the Scholiasta Bobiensis drew from Asconius or not, but it seems odd to find in the text 'Asconius says' or 'Asconius thinks' (p. 172) when the statement is made by the Scholiast, not by Asconius.

These are small blemishes. There is, however, a feature of Professor Sihler's book against which it is necessary to protest, viz. its style. Frequently his sentences have no construction (e.g. p. 154).

'There were a few centuries which were pleased to cast their ballots without pay. A few. An awful indictment of the decadent republic so-called.' So (p. 258) 'Caesar's liberality to Quintus as due to Marcus. Of which there can be little doubt.' One is tempted to conjecture here *was* for *as*. The grammar leaves much to be desired, e.g. we find 'MSS.' used as a singular (pp. 72, 117, 328), and (p. 208) we are told that 'Politics makes strange bed-fellows.' Also (p. 446) we have 'you boy, that owest.' Professor Sihler is very fond of long words, e.g. (p. 18), 'Unfortunately for his germinating professional life-purposes no other courts were then held.' Here 'legal studies' would be shorter. On p. 409 we read, 'The Eschatology of his nobler aspirations, the indestructible residuum at the bottom of the cup of life, clusters around Plato's *Phaedo*, or the conclusion of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, his peroration here, a work much thumbed by him or nearly read to pieces.' Other passages are more colloquial, e.g. (p. 287) 'How busy men will be and how fuzzy about



such dribblets of factitious fame!' or (p. 126) 'a force and fervor, which came from Cicero with particular vim.' 'Doxographical bent' (p. 386) is an odd phrase, also 'clover-leaf' in the sense of trio; thus (p. 343), the younger Quintus, Statius, and Philotimus are termed a 'clover-leaf of disesteemed persons,' and (p. 321) Q. Cassius, Antony, and Curio are called a 'clover-leaf of servitors.' The word 'servitor' occurs with monotonous regularity for all ordinary synonyms, e.g. supporter, adherent, follower.

The spelling is odd and inconsistent. We find Caesarian and Caesarean sometimes on the same page (e.g. pp. 319, 330), so Philistos, Theopompos, Ephoros on the same page with Timaeus. Brogitars is shortened to Brogitars (p. 241). Cotyla (or Cotylo) is called Cotylas (p. 438), while Damassippus (p. 361) is a strange form. The tribune Quinctius (*Cic. Clu.* 103) appears as *Quinctus* (p. 109), while conversely Sextus Pompeius is always called Sextius Pompey. We are accustomed to speak of Marcus Antonius as Antony, but to use the full form of his brothers. Professor Sihler generally speaks of Lucius Antony, though sometimes of Lucius or Gaius Antonius. Sometimes he combines both methods, e.g. (p. 450)

Lucius Antony and Gaius Antonius occur on the same page.

The translations are somewhat bald, as may be judged from the following specimen (p. 49 = *Cic. Rosc. Am.* 134):

'Decent ones (i.e. wine-parties) I dare say in such a residence, if this is to be rated a residence rather than a workshop of wickedness and a tavern of shameless deeds. His own flitting about the Forum, how ubiquitous it is, his head carefully gotten up by his hairdressers and perfumed with unguents, with a great number of retainers wearing the garb of Roman gentlemen, you see, gentlemen of the jury.'

The famous *mot* about Octavian, attributed to Cicero, *laudandum adulescentem, ornandum, tollendum*, is translated, 'that young person must be praised, equipped, and manoeuvred beyond this plane.' Perhaps 'sent to another place' would be a better rendering of the pun. The phrase *ad perpendicularum exigere*, i.e. *columnas*, is translated (p. 77) by 'examine as to plumb.' The meaning is 'test by the plumb-line,' i.e. see if they were quite straight.

It is unfortunate that a work which shows so much industry and is in many ways very useful is defaced by these blemishes.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

## SHORT NOTICES

*Some Greek and Roman Ideas of a Future Life.* By CYRIL BAILEY. Pp. 24. Leeds and District Branch of the Classical Association. 1915.

MR. BAILEY'S contribution to his subject consists not so much in the material which he has been content to gather from familiar sources, as in the freshness of his emphasis. He moves towards the general mind—'how little the mind of man has changed!'—and finds it not least expressive of itself in a Midland churchyard of to-day. In his lecture he called the attention of his hearers to the deep

currents of belief which swirl and eddy about the grave, and fetch up in distant places where they can still be forced to give up their secret. Religious tradition is a revelation not only of man but from man; and so far as comparative method defines and universalises this tradition, it contributes to a new theology. The other day I read in an inscription that Bishop Quodvuldeus (*sic*) made a building in honour of a martyr *iubente deo Cristo nostro*. But a Roman could restore a shrine of his gods *iussu deorum* and *pro salutem suam* (*sic*). It is not an accident, therefore, Mr. Bailey affirms, that religious tradi-

tion and the flower of immortality blossom from the same dust and ashes. When the reformers in Germany and Geneva stamped out, along with other usages, the popular prayers for the dead, they did not foresee that human beings who do not pray for the dead whom they loved would become careless about prayers for themselves. My real indebtedness, therefore, to Mr. Bailey (and to the Leeds and District Branch of the Classical Association for publishing his paper) is qualified by the pessimism of the Midland vicar (p. 1). 'I have no doubt,' he said, 'that the real religion of these people centres not in the Church but in the churchyard.'

FRANK GRANGER.

*A School Atlas of Ancient History.* Thirty-three maps and plans, printed in colours, with plans of cities in black and white, and notes on historical geography. W. and K. Johnston, 1912. 2s. net.

THIS is the most useful School Atlas of Ancient History that we have seen. In addition to the political maps, there are physical maps, orographically coloured, and maps showing climate and vegetation. The historical notes (6 pp.) are full of valuable geographical and historical information, the printing is clear, and there is a complete Index.

G.

*Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Romanes im Altertum.* By OTMAR SCHISSEL VON FLESCHENBERG. Pp. xx+110. Halle: Niemeyer. M. 3.40.

THE author has written several volumes on this and kindred subjects, and clearly intends to carry on the investigations so magnificently opened by Rohde. He does not deal at all with the texts of the Greek novels; his interests are entirely literary: and although his theories as to the exact method in which they developed from one another are hardly likely to gain universal assent, his work claims the attention of all who take any interest in this difficult subject. The most obvious criticism on the book is that the various novels do not fit so exactly as he con-

tends into the various types which he enumerates (e.g. Heliodorus as a *neuplatonischer Tendenzroman*, Achilles Tatius as a *Moderoman*); but his analysis is always acute and skilful, and his criticism founded on a real and deep knowledge of his subject. The chapter in which he attempts a reconstruction of the Ninus-novel from the very fragmentary remains that have come down to us calls for special praise.

S. GASELEE.

#### THE ANCIENT TRADE-ROUTE TO INDIA.

*Parthian Stations*, by Isidore of Charoux. By W. H. SCHOFF. Philadelphia: Published by the Commercial Museum. 25 cents.

MR. SCHOFF, of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum, who lately gave us a useful edition of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* (C.R. xxvii. 210), has now treated in the same manner a Greek pamphlet whose title is given above. The pamphlet is only a record of names and distances, with a few details added now and then: as that 'they are always sacrificing' at Ecbatana, and 'an everlasting fire is kept up' at Asaac. Fragments of the same author are collected from Athenaeus, Pliny, and elsewhere. Notes are added to each place, where they can be identified, or the text illustrated from other sources, with quotations from travellers. Two maps are added: one of the trade-route, one of modern railways. The book is well compiled and deserves attention. I noted two misprints in the Greek (p. 4, l. 15, *σκοῖνοι, τῇ*); and it is difficult to see why *σταθμός* is several times translated 'stations.'

W. H. D. R.

*Studi Storici per l'Antichità Classica, Vol. VI.* Edited by ETTORE PAIS. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 240. Pavia: Mattei and Co., 1913.

THIS volume will be chiefly interesting to students of the history of the last century of the Roman Republic. It contains a fresh instalment of Frac-

caro's studies on the Gracchan period, consisting in a collection of the fragments of the orators of that epoch, together with a running commentary. This will be found valuable on account of the fulness of its references to the sources, ancient and modern; we are glad to note that the author shows a thorough familiarity with the work of English scholars—Greenidge, Underhill (whose name, however, he almost always aspirates), Warde Fowler, etc. This article is followed by an essay by E. Ciaceri on the trials of Gabinius and Rabirius Postumus in B.C. 54. Without adding much to our knowledge, the author puts certain matters in fresh lights; he is, for example, inclined to take a more favourable view of Gabinius than that conventionally adopted by those who follow Cicero in all things. He accepts Dessau's arguments as proving that Rabirius Postumus is to be identified with the 'Curtius'

or 'Postumus' of Cicero's later correspondence, from which it follows that Rabirius secured a seat in the Senate and even had aspirations after the consulship under the Caesarian régime; and he rightly points out that this does not necessarily imply—what has been assumed in consequence—that Cicero's speech in his behalf secured a verdict in his favour, for the trial was not (strictly speaking) a criminal one, involving exile as the normal consequence of condemnation, but a suit for recovery of monies under the *quo ea pecunia pervenerit* clause of the Lex Julia de Repetundis.

Amongst the other contents of the volume mention may be made of Ettore Pais' article on Fundi, a cogent plea for the excavation of the site, and an examination of the names given to Western peoples in the Old Testament by Oberziner.

H. STUART-JONES.

## CORRESPONDENCE

*To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.*

I AM much obliged to Mr. Sloman for correcting my mistake as to the manuscript reading in Ovid, *Ars am.* III. 758. I am sorry that through pure carelessness I did him a slight injustice.

As to my appeal to Plautus I should like to say a few words. In our elementary books we naturally keep for the sake of simplicity and consistency to the Latin of a certain period. But it sometimes happens that we want a word or a form for which we cannot find evidence in the writers of that period. What is the best course to follow in such a case? Take, for instance, this interesting verb *edo*. It cannot be ignored, and yet, when we come to set out its forms, we cannot find authority for them all in the writers of the Golden Age. Some of the 'irregular' forms (*e.g. esse, est, esset*) occur quite frequently enough in prose and poetry of various kinds to show that they were in general use,

and we have no evidence that 'regular' forms such as *edere* were beginning to supplant them.<sup>1</sup> But it so happens that the Imperative does not occur. On the other hand, we can see from Plautus that *es* was the form in use in his day, and we have no reason to suppose that any change had taken place in the time of Cicero and Augustus. Are we then to tell beginners that we do not know the Classical Latin for 'eat that'? Or shall we give them the form which we know to have been in use a few generations earlier? We can at any rate be quite sure that Cicero and his friends would have understood it and accepted it as a Latin word, which is more than we can say of its rival *ede*.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

<sup>1</sup> See Professor Postgate's article "To eat" and "to drink" in Latin, (*C. R.* XVI. 1902, pp. 110-115).

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.*

*\* \* Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- American Journal of Philology.* Edited by B. L. Gildersleeve. Vol. XXXVI. 1, No. 141. Pp. 1-124. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1915.
- Apulei Apologia* (sive Pro se de Magia Liber), with Introduction and Commentary by H. E. Butler and A. S. Owen. 8" x 5½". Pp. lxvi + 208. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Duckett* (E. S.) *Studies in Ennius.* Bryn Mawr College Monographs. Vol. xviii. Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1915. 9" x 6". Pp. 80.
- Edwards* (G. M.) *An English Greek Lexicon* (second edition). 8½" x 6½". Pp. xxxii + 338. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 9s. net.
- Einhard* (Life of Charlemagne). The Latin text, with notes. By H. W. Garrod and R. B. Mowat. 7½" x 5". Pp. lx + 82. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Euripides* (Alcestis). Translated into Rhyming Verse, with Explanatory Notes. By Gilbert Murray. 7½" x 5". Pp. xvi + 82. London: Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1915. 1s. net.
- Pennell* (J.) *Pictures in the Land of Temples.* A series of lithographs, with notes by the artist. 9½" x 7". 40 plates. London: W. Heinemann, 1915. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Rolleston* (J. D.). *Lucian and Medicine.* 10" x 7". Pp. 24. London: J. Bale, Sons and Danielsson.
- Schoff* (W. H.) *Parthian Stations.* By Isidore of Charoux. An account of the overland trade route between the Levant and India in the first century, B.C. Greek text, with translation and commentary. Philadelphia: Published by the Commercial Museum, 1914. 9½" x 6". Pp. 50.
- Sophocles* (Electra). *Standard Flags for Amateur Performance.* By E. Fogerty. 7½" x 5½". Pp. xiv + 55. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1915. Paper, 6d. net.; Costume edition, 2s. 6d. net.
- Tacitus* (Annals, Book IV.) Edited by G. M. Edwards. 7" x 4¾". Pp. xxvii + 144. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 3s. net.
- Theologisch Tijdschrift* (Afl. III.). Edited by B. D. Eerdmans. 9½" x 5¾". Pp. 177-260. Leiden: S. C. van Doesburgh, 1915.
- Viljoen* (H. G.) *Herodoti Fragmenta in Papyris Servata.* (Doctors' dissertation.) 9½" x 5¾". Pp. x + 60 + 8. Gröningen, Scholten, 1915.



at for

lished

eine-

icine.  
Sons

idore  
rland  
ia in  
with  
hia :  
1914.

for  
erty.  
ullen  
rume

. M.  
Cam-  
net.  
lited  
260.

a in  
(on.)  
chol-